



Calhoun: The NPS Institutional Archive

Theses and Dissertations

Thesis Collection

2013-09

An empirical study of the contracting officer representatives social network

Babcock, Virginia

Monterey, California: Naval Postgraduate School

<http://hdl.handle.net/10945/37581>



Calhoun is a project of the Dudley Knox Library at NPS, furthering the precepts and goals of open government and government transparency. All information contained herein has been approved for release by the NPS Public Affairs Officer.

Dudley Knox Library / Naval Postgraduate School
411 Dyer Road / 1 University Circle
Monterey, California USA 93943

<http://www.nps.edu/library>



NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA

JOINT APPLIED PROJECT

AN EMPIRICAL STUDY OF THE CONTRACTING OFFICER REPRESENTATIVE'S SOCIAL NETWORK

**By: Virginia Babcock
Patrick Hamilton
Derrick Torgerson**

September 2013

**Advisors: Janie Maddox
Ralucca Gera**

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			<i>Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188</i>	
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instruction, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188) Washington DC 20503.				
1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)		2. REPORT DATE September 2013	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Joint Applied Project	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE AN EMPIRICAL STUDY OF THE CONTRACTING OFFICER REPRESENTATIVE'S SOCIAL NETWORK			5. FUNDING NUMBERS N/A	
6. AUTHOR(S) Virginia Babcock, Patrick Hamilton, Derrick Torgerson				
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943-5000			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING /MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) N/A			10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES The views expressed in this thesis are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of Defense or the U.S. government. IRB protocol number ____NPS.2013.0046-IR-EP7-A____.				
12a. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release, distribution is unlimited			12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE A	
13. ABSTRACT (maximum 200 words) The volume and amount of money spent on services, which includes construction, acquired by the Department of Defense has steadily grown over the past several fiscal years. Recent studies on services acquisition have not only shown the challenges in acquiring these services but also how they are managed. One member that is intimately involved with the management of service and construction contracts is the contracting officer's representative (COR). The COR acts as the eyes and ears of the procuring contracting officer and is primarily responsible for monitoring the performance of the service by the contractor to ensure they are meeting all requirements outlined in the contract or the work statement. The purpose of this study is to better understand the social network of the COR. The goal is to answer the following questions: 1)What is the structure of the COR's social network and what members are included in it, 2) How does communication transpire between each member of the network, and 3) What conclusions can be drawn from the analysis of the social network.				
14. SUBJECT TERMS Service contracts, services acquisition, contracting officer's representative, contractor surveillance, social network			15. NUMBER OF PAGES 97	
			16. PRICE CODE	
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT Unclassified	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE Unclassified	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT Unclassified	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UU	

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited

**AN EMPIRICAL STUDY OF THE CONTRACTING OFFICER
REPRESENTATIVE'S SOCIAL NETWORK**

Virginia Babcock, Civilian, United States Army
Patrick Hamilton, Civilian, United States Army
Derrick Torgerson, Civilian, United States Army

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE IN CONTRACT MANAGEMENT

from the

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
September 2013

Authors: Virginia Babcock
Patrick Hamilton
Derrick Torgerson

Approved by: Janie Maddox
Ralucca Gera

William R. Gates, Dean
Graduate School of Business and Public Policy

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

AN EMPERICAL STUDY OF THE CONTRACTING OFFICER REPRESENTATIVE'S SOCIAL NETWORK

ABSTRACT

The volume and amount of money spent on services, which includes construction, acquired by the Department of Defense has steadily grown over the past several fiscal years. Recent studies on services acquisition have not only shown the challenges in acquiring these services but also how they are managed. One member that is intimately involved with the management of service and construction contracts is the contracting officer's representative (COR). The COR acts as the eyes and ears of the procuring contracting officer and is primarily responsible for monitoring the performance of the service by the contractor to ensure they are meeting all requirements outlined in the contract or the work statement. The purpose of this study is to better understand the social network of the COR. The goal is to answer the following questions: 1)What is the structure of the COR's social network and what members are included in it, 2) How does communication transpire between each member of the network, and 3) What conclusions can be drawn from the analysis of the social network.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
A.	BACKGROUND	1
B.	PURPOSE.....	4
C.	RESEARCH QUESTIONS	4
D.	BENEFITS AND LIMITATIONS.....	5
E.	ORGANIZATION OF THE REPORT.....	6
F.	SUMMARY	6
II.	LITERATURE REVIEW	7
A.	INTRODUCTION.....	7
B.	SERVICES CONTRACTING	7
C.	CHALLENGES.....	10
D.	SUMMARY	12
III.	RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	13
A.	INTRODUCTION.....	13
B.	PARTICIPANT SELECTION	13
C.	DATA COLLECTION QUESTIONS.....	13
D.	ANALYTICAL PROCESS	14
E.	SUMMARY	16
IV.	RESULTS AND ANALYSIS	17
A.	INTRODUCTION.....	17
B.	SOCIAL NETWORK LOCATION	17
C.	COR SOCIAL NETWORK A	18
1.	Social Network Structure	19
2.	Member Roles and Responsibilities	20
3.	Network Communication	20
D.	COR SOCIAL NETWORK B	21
1.	Social Network Structure	21
2.	Member Roles and Responsibilities	22
3.	Network Communication	23
E.	COR SOCIAL NETWORK C	24
1.	Social Network Structure	24
2.	Member Roles and Responsibilities	25
3.	Network Communication	26
F.	SOCIAL NETWORK ANALYSIS.....	26
G.	SUMMARY	29
V.	SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, AND AREAS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH.....	31
A.	SUMMARY	31
B.	CONCLUSION	32
1.	Research Findings.....	32
2.	Recommendations	37

C.	AREAS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH.....	37
APPENDIX A.	INTERVIEW QUESTIONS	39
APPENDIX B.	COR SOCIAL NETWORK A INTERVIEWS	43
APPENDIX C.	COR SOCIAL NETWORK B INTERVIEWS	57
APPENDIX D.	COR SOCIAL NETWORK C INTERVIEWS	65
	LIST OF REFERENCES.....	77
	INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST	81

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.	Top Line DoD Contract Spending, 1999–2011 (From Ellman, Morrow, & Sanders, 2012).....	2
Figure 2.	Defense Drawdowns Compared 1948–2020 (From Murdock, 2013)	3
Figure 3.	Fiscal Year 2012 Obligations (From DPAP, 2013)	8
Figure 4.	DoD-wide Acquisition of Services Taxonomy (From DPAP, 2013)	9
Figure 5.	Sample Social Network (From Judy, 2012).....	15
Figure 6.	Graph of Contracting Officer’s Representative Social Network A	19
Figure 7.	Graph of Contracting Officer’s Representative Social Network B	22
Figure 8.	Graph of Contracting Officer’s Representative Social Network C	25

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ACC	Army Contracting Command
ACC-APG	Army Contracting Command-Aberdeen Proving Ground
ACOR	Assistant Contracting Officer's Representative
APG	Aberdeen Proving Ground
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act
CLIN	Contract Line Item Number
CONUS	Contiguous United States
COR	Contracting Officer's Representative
CPARS	Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System
CRS	Congressional Research Service
CTOR	Contracting Officer's Technical Representative
DFARS	Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement
DFAS	Defense Finance and Accounting Service
DoD	Department of Defense
FAR	Federal Acquisition Regulation
FY	Fiscal Year
GAO	General Accounting Office (before July 7, 2004 Government Accountability Office (beginning July 7, 2004)
GFEBs	General Fund Enterprise Business System
IAW	In Accordance With
ID/IQ	Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity
IGCE	Independent Government Cost Estimate
IRB	Institutional Review Board
KO	Contracting Officer
NAICS	North American Industry Classification System
OCONUS	Outside Contiguous United States
PARC	Principal Assistant Responsible for Contracting
PCF	Paperless Contract File

PCO	Procuring Contracting Officer
PGI	Procedures, Guidance and Information
PM	Program Manager
POP	Period of Performance
PWS	Performance Work Statement
QASP	Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan
SME	Subject Matter Expert
SOW	Statement of Work
TPOC	Technical Point of Contact
USD, AT&L	Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics
VCE	Virtual Contracting Enterprise
WAWF	Wide Area Work Flow

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Joint Applied Project team of Virginia Babcock, Patrick Hamilton and Derrick Torgerson would like to thank our advisors: Ms. Janie Maddox, Graduate School of Business and Public Policy and Dr. Ralucca Gera, Applied Mathematics Department, for their guidance and support. We also want to acknowledge and thank our families for their understanding of the time and effort involved in this project. Finally, we are grateful for good teammates who worked well together to complete this project.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

I. INTRODUCTION

A. BACKGROUND

Since the terrorist attacks of September 11 and subsequent wars that followed, the procurement of supplies and services by the Department of Defense (DoD) has rapidly increased. The expansion of this purchasing coincided with the increased demands of contingency operations abroad in Iraq and Afghanistan. As seen in the Naval Postgraduate School research paper “An Empirical Study of the Social Network of the Contracting Officer’s Representative” (Judy, 2012), services had become the fastest growing contract spending category from 1990 to 2010. New data has become available since this study was performed and, according to a report from the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), there was a slight decrease in obligations for services between 2010 and 2011. While the trend of overall DoD contract spending seemed to have peaked, service acquisition spending continues to be a significant percentage of overall DoD outlays and remains vital to the mission of the DoD. Figure 1 illustrates the steady rise in contract spending from 1990 to 2011.




Figure 1. Top Line DoD Contract Spending, 1999–2011 (From Ellman, Morrow, & Sanders, 2012)

With the ripples now being felt from sequestration, the budget environment has changed and will continue to change for the procurement of services and supplies. The projected cuts in defense spending already begun will most likely affect all DoD obligations in the coming years. Starting this year, the DoD furloughed its civilian workforce to reduce expenditures. The result is a “do more with less” policy for the contracting workforce, translating into increased difficulty managing the contract oversight responsibility (Defense AT&L, 2013). This pattern of doing more with less has appeared throughout the history of the DoD’s budget authority as seen in Figure 2.




Figure 2. Defense Drawdowns Compared 1948–2020 (From Murdock, 2013)

While the DoD has taken steps to reduce spending, to include furloughing employees, the acquisition workload in contracting for services remains high and the need for contract oversight even more so. According to Gansler, “From 1995 to 2006 acquisition dollars increased by 382 percent, acquisition actions increased by 359 percent, yet the acquisition workforce decreased by 53 percent” (Gansler, 2011). In response to this imbalance, in April of 2009, the Secretary of Defense, Robert Gates, announced an initiative to grow the defense acquisition workforce by 20,000 positions by fiscal year (FY) 2015 using the Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund (U.S. Army Acquisition Support Center, 2011). However, the current freeze on hiring, due to sequestration, will make attainment of this goal virtually impossible. The need for improvement of the contracting officer’s representative (COR) oversight ability is apparent and without the additional manpower, essential.

There have been several Government Accountability Office (GAO) reports and initiatives over the last several years calling for greater efficiency and productivity in defense spending for service contracts. The bulk of these GAO reports call attention to the lack of oversight and management of the increasing number of contractors performing services for the DoD. The ultimate responsibility for contract oversight lies with the contracting officer (KO). However, the KO relies on and typically delegates this authority to a more specialized individual or individuals. The COR is usually assigned based on possessing the specific technical knowledge enabling them to monitor and provide the necessary contract performance oversight. The COR role is the most pivotal position in ensuring the government receives the services it has purchased, therefore a closer examination of how the COR accomplishes the tasks associated with contract oversight should provide valuable insight.

B. PURPOSE

The purpose of this research is to provide further data and analysis for the development of a comprehensive understanding of the CORs' social networks and what effect they have on service contract oversight. The lack of COR surveillance on service contracts motivates the understanding of the COR communication network. We model and assess COR communication networks to determine the key social network members. The overall goal of the research being conducted for this report is to identify best practices, weaknesses, and to provide recommendations for improvement of the COR oversight of service contracts.

C. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

In order to expand upon on and contribute relevant data to the previous work accomplished on this subject, our research uses similar primary and secondary questions as they relate to the COR's social network:

Primary:

- What effects do attributes of the COR's social network have on surveillance of the service contract?

Secondary:

- What is the structure of the COR's social network, and which members are included in it?
- What roles and responsibilities does each member within the network have with regards to the management of the service contract?
- How does communication transpire between each member of the social network, what information is shared, and how often does communication occur?
- What conclusions can be drawn from the analysis of each social network?

D. BENEFITS AND LIMITATIONS

The data gathered for this research will further the understanding of the CORs' social networks in providing successful oversight of service contracts. Our research will contribute to previous studies on service acquisitions by providing additional data, samples sets and independent analysis. This report has updated and expanded upon previous research conducted (Judy, 2012) and will provide a more substantial foundation for further studies of the COR's social network.

The previous research conducted (Judy, 2012) on this topic contributed to the overall understanding of the COR's social network. However, the enormous number of service contracts used in the DoD and the complexity of each limited the scope of this research. The sample size evaluated consisted of three social networks for analysis. While this is a relatively small number in comparison to the number of social networks in existence for service contracts within the DoD, we believe it will contribute to the overall picture of the COR's social network. The focus of the current research is also constrained to one military installation, Aberdeen Proving Ground (APG), Maryland.

In order to collect the necessary data for an analysis of the COR's social network, we elected to perform a comprehensive interview of all the primary individual contacts associated with oversight of the service contract. These individuals were the COR, procuring contracting officer (PCO), contractor's representative, and customer's representative

E. ORGANIZATION OF THE REPORT

This report is organized into five chapters. Chapter I consists of introductory information for the research and a brief background. Also included within this chapter is the purpose for the research, primary questions we strive to answer, and the benefits and limitations of the research. In Chapter II, we introduce a review of current literature on services acquisition. This encompasses reports from the GAO and Congressional Research Service (CRS) as well as recent research reports from students at the Naval Postgraduate School. In Chapter III, we describe the methodology used during this study. Chapter IV presents the information gathered from the interviews. Chapter V consists of an overall summary of the research, conclusions, recommendations, and areas for future study.

F. SUMMARY

Recent GAO and Congressional reports have highlighted some significant shortfalls in contract oversight and reemphasized a need for improvement. While the PCO is ultimately responsible for contract oversight, the COR is relied upon to perform a majority of these duties. In order to successfully monitor contractor performance in accordance with contract requirements, the COR creates and manages a social network. The COR's social network is the focus of our research in which we analyze three COR social networks of three service contracts to draw conclusions in answering our primary research question, which is what effects do attributes of the COR's social network have on surveillance of the service contract?

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. INTRODUCTION

This chapter will include available recent literature from GAO reports, CRS reports and various other sources related to the acquisition of services. The literature included within this report will identify recent developments in federal government spending and the effects on acquisition programs and processes. Our intent is to expand upon the Naval Postgraduate School research paper “An Empirical Study of the Social Network of the Contracting Officer’s Representative” (Judy, 2012).

B. SERVICES CONTRACTING

The DoD obligated about \$361 billion on contracts in FY 2012 for goods and services (GAO, 2012), a decrease of \$8.6 billion from FY 2011 (DPAP, 2012). Of that \$361 billion figure, over half was for services alone (DPAP, 2012). Those services include such things as information technology, weapons-system maintenance, transportation, medical services and others as depicted in Figure 3.



FY12 Obligations




Figure 3. Fiscal Year 2012 Obligations (From DPAP, 2013)

One aspect of services contracting involves contract administration, managing the relationship between the Government and the contractor to ensure that both parties meet their contractual obligations (Apte, Ferrer, Lewis, & Rendon, 2006). An important feature is contract surveillance by Government personnel to ensure that the contractor provides the services as described in the contract. Most notably, the government personnel called upon to perform the surveillance is the COR, the contracting officer's 'eyes and ears' on the ground (DPAP, 2012).

Federal Acquisition Regulations (FAR) Subpart 2.1, Definitions, defines a COR as an individual, including a contracting officer's technical representative (CTOR), designated and authorized in writing by the contracting officer to perform specific technical or administrative functions (FAR, 2013).

DFARS 252.201-7000, Contracting Officer's Representative, says the written authorization will specify the extent of the COR's authority to act on behalf of the

contracting officer. The COR is not authorized to make any commitments or changes that will affect price, quality, quantity, delivery, or any other term or condition of the contract (DFARS, 2013).

Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplemental (DFARS) Procedures, Guidance and Information (PGI) 201.602-2, Responsibilities, directs contracting officers to designate a COR for all service contracts, including both firm fixed price and other than firm fixed price contracts, awarded by a DoD component or by any other federal agency on behalf of the DoD (DFARS PGI, 2013). Therefore, with few exceptions, all defense service contracts must have an appointed COR.

The DoD procures a wide array of services, see Figure 4. CORs, often subject-matter experts (SME) in these various services, are appointed by the KO to provide contract oversight.




Figure 4. DoD-wide Acquisition of Services Taxonomy (From DPAP, 2013)

DFARS Subpart 246.102 requires that departments and agencies develop and manage a systematic, cost-effective government contract quality assurance program. The COR should be intricately involved in developing this program for the contract to which he or she is assigned. It is the responsibility of the COR, as part of the acquisition team, to assist in developing performance requirements and quality levels/standards, because the COR will be the one responsible for conducting that oversight (DPAP, 2012). Within contracting circles, this program is known as a quality assurance surveillance plan (QASP) and, per *FAR Subpart 46.401*, the plan should specify for each contract:

- all work requiring surveillance,
- the method of surveillance,
- the place or places where the government reserves the right to perform quality assurance

- shall be performed by or under the direction or supervision of government personnel
- shall be documented on an inspection report form (DFARS, 2013).

The COR's most important role in the QASP is to monitor the contractor's performance under the contract. The duties and responsibilities of the COR are outlined in the written appointment letter signed by the contracting officer. It is imperative that the COR and anyone else involved with monitoring contract performance reads and understands the contract and has the training, knowledge, experience, skills, and ability to perform his or her roles. The COR must know the performance requirements and standards in depth and understand the assessment strategies contained in the QASP. The COR should also be an effective communicator with good interpersonal skills (DPAP, 2012).

C. CHALLENGES

Problems have plagued the acquisition of services in the past. Weaknesses in the acquisition process include inadequate acquisition planning, poorly written requirements, use of the wrong type of contract, and an insufficient number of qualified and capable acquisition and contract oversight personnel. These can increase the risk of poor contract

performance, which in turn can lead to waste, fraud and abuse (Manuel, 2013). The GAO has reported on multiple occasions that lack of oversight, both in the operational and stateside realms, has resulted in extreme contractor abuses (GAO, 2011).

The DoD has recognized the need to dedicate sufficient resources to provide effective oversight. It has made progress in growing the acquisition workforce by adding 17,500 civilians from fiscal year 2009 to December 2011 by use of the Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund through additional hiring and training initiatives (GAO, 2012). The National Defense Authorization Act for FY2013 (*P.L. 112-239*), Section 803 issued on January 2, 2013, extended expedited hiring authority to fill shortages in the defense acquisition workforce through 2017. These acquisition positions include COR positions, as described by *10 U.S.C 1721*, Designation of Acquisition Positions.

However, with the sequestration order given by President Obama on March 1, 2013, and the DoD hiring freeze in effect, the gains in acquisition workforce may begin to erode. Currently, 17 percent of the workforce is eligible for full retirement in 2013; 19 percent are eligible within five years; workforce gains decreased 32 percent from FY 2010 to FY 2011; and losses spiked up 32 percent from FY 2010 to FY 2011 (OUSD[C]/CFO, 2012).

The DoD has also completed competency assessments that identify the current skills and capabilities of the workforce and help identify areas needing further attention. However, the DoD has not issued an updated strategic acquisition workforce plan because of budget uncertainties (GAO, 2011).

Mr. Frank Kendall, Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics (USD, AT&L), issued the *Better Buying Power 2.0* initiative on November 12, 2012 in an effort to obtain greater efficiency and productivity in defense spending by improving the way the DoD acquires critical defense goods and services. One of the ways to improve efficiency will be made through improvements in the tradecraft of services acquisition. The DoD is aggressively managing the more than \$200 billion that it spends

annually on services (such as information technology services, weapons-systems maintenance, and transportation).

In support of this goal, the DoD has increased training for the acquisition of services as well as for CORs, and has developed on-line tools to aid in the development of requirements. Notable examples of training for the acquisition of services are the Defense Acquisition University services acquisition workshops, the Acquisition Requirements Roadmap Tool, and DoD's model curriculum for both classroom and online training of CORs with a variant and a handbook specifically tailored for CORs deployed in contingency operations (OUSD[C]/CFO, 2012).

D. SUMMARY

The FY 2013 budget supports continued strengthening of the acquisition workforce to ensure we achieve and sustain sufficient workforce capacity and capability. The DoD has a continuing responsibility to procure the critical goods and services needed by the Armed Forces but will not have ever-increasing budgets to pay for them. As a result, the DoD must be more productive—in other words, do more without spending more (OUSD[C]/CFO, 2012).

This do-more-without-spending-more way of doing business will put more pressure on the COR's role in the acquisition process. Contracting personnel will need to develop better, more efficient methods of surveillance of service contracts to help the COR perform this very essential job.

Noting the importance of the COR in service contract surveillance through previously cited works, our research will contribute to recent research on the social network of the COR. For the COR to be successful in the required duties of the position, we study the relationship that exists between the COR and other members of that network, including the PCO, the customer receiving the service and the contractor. Our study of these relationships is to understand whether there is or is not a lack of surveillance on service contracts that can affect the outcome of the contract. We model and assess COR communication networks to determine the key social network members.

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A. INTRODUCTION

Since our study is a follow-on to the Naval Postgraduate School research paper “An Empirical Study of the Social Network of the Contracting Officer’s Representative” (Judy, 2012), we limited our empirical study of a social network to the four primary roles associated with the service contract. For each service contract selected, we interviewed the individuals in the roles of COR, PCO, the representative for the customer who receives the service and the representative for the contractor who provides the service to the customer (Judy, 2012).

B. PARTICIPANT SELECTION

For this study, we followed the procedures below to select interviewees within each COR’s social network.

- Identify PCOs and ask them to participate in the study.
- Have the PCOs select a service contract they are responsible for, and have an appointed COR to assist with monitoring the contract.
- Have the PCOs provide contact information for the COR, customer, and contractor.
- Ask each of these individuals whether he or she is willing to participate in the study. If the individual agrees to participate, begin the interview process.

We followed these steps with each of the CORs’ social networks examined during the course of this study.

C. DATA COLLECTION QUESTIONS

As this study revolves around the social network of the COR, communication between members of this network and its effect on contract surveillance is the focus. The interview questions were designed to gather three types of data for analysis: information on the structure of the social network, information on communication that occurs between members of the social network, and information on each member’s role and responsibilities with regards to the service contract. To determine the structure of the

social network, each member was asked with whom they communicate about the service contract. To gather information about communication within the network, each member was asked how often they communicate with other members of the network, what means of communication they use, what reasons they communicate with each other, and what types of information they share. Lastly, each member was asked what their primary duties were with regards to the service contract, at what phase in the contract procurement process they were appointed to their role, what training or certification they received, how they conduct surveillance of the service (COR specific), how they monitor the service contract, and of what surveillance of the service they were aware (all the questions can be found in Appendix A)?

Because of restrictions in place from the Naval Postgraduate School Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (IRB), our study was limited to only contracts under the auspices of the Principal Assistant Responsible for Contracting (PARC) at APG, Maryland. We chose three contracts that were similar in size (dollar value) and complexity to those chosen by Judy in his research to maintain consistency since our study is a follow-on study and is part of a larger study being conducted by our advisors. All three service contracts chosen for review were awarded by contracting officers of Army Contracting Command-APG (ACC-APG). Each contract has a COR that is located at APG. Contract A is for scientific and engineering support for the development of instrumentation systems and test facilities as described in each issued task order. Contract B is for services necessary for sample data and field sample data collection as described in each task order. Contract C is for environmental remediation services for six sites at APG, Maryland.

D. ANALYTICAL PROCESS

There are two primary elements of a social network graph: nodes and edges. Nodes represent members within the network, and the edges indicate a relationship between two nodes. In this report, nodes on a graph represent members of the COR's social network. Each node is labeled with the role that member serves with relation to the service contract (e.g., PCO, COR, customer, or contractor). An edge connecting two

nodes indicates that communication occurs between those two members in the network, and the color of the line indicates the frequency of communication that occurs (e.g., daily, two to four times a week, once a week, once a week). Finally, a rectangle around nodes indicates that those members are located in the same vicinity (e.g., in the same office or building) (Judy, 2012). Figure 5 is an example of a graphical representation of a social network.




Figure 5. Sample Social Network (From Judy, 2012)

We analyzed each of the social networks we studied by conducting a series of interviews with members serving one of the four primary roles associated with the service contract. Based on information gathered during the interviews, we were able to map out each COR social network and illustrate the topology using a graph. We then used the three types of data gathered during the interviews to define attributes of each social network and determine what impact each has on the surveillance of the service

contract. Lastly, to help answer the primary research question, we compared the social networks to each other and looked for trends that might affect the surveillance of the service contract.

E. SUMMARY

In this chapter, we identified the process to select interviewees, the type of information we intended to obtain from each individual, and the method to represent the results of that data collection. In the next chapter, we report the results of our investigation and interviews for each social network and report on the analysis of the data.

IV. RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

A. INTRODUCTION

This chapter will include an analysis of the social network interviews to answer the secondary questions proposed:

- What is the structure of the COR's social network, and which members are included in it?
- What role and responsibilities does each member within the network have with regards to the management of the service contract?
- How does communication transpire between each member of the social network, what information is shared, and how often does communication occur?
- What conclusions can be drawn from the analysis of each social network?

We begin the chapter by describing Aberdeen Proving Ground, the military installation where all three social networks are based. Next, we answer each of the first three above questions for each of the three social networks studied. Finally, we answer question number four from above by providing an analysis, with our conclusions, for each of the three social networks.

B. SOCIAL NETWORK LOCATION

Aberdeen Proving Ground (APG) was established in Maryland's Harford County in 1917 to provide the nation a site where Army materiel could be tested. At the same time, the Edgewood Arsenal was established nearby to provide a site for the development, production, and testing of chemical warfare materiel. The two installations were officially joined as Aberdeen Proving Ground in 1971.

APG is Harford County's largest employer with more than 21,000 civilian, military and contractor employees. APG contributes more than \$400 million in payroll and \$500 million in contracts annually. A \$1 billion research and development resource, and a key player in the nation's homeland defense and international counter-terrorism efforts, APG is an economic and technology resource for the region. (APG facts, 2013)

APG is home to 11 major U.S. Army commands including Research, Development and Engineering Command (RDECOM), Army Contracting Command Aberdeen Proving Ground (ACC-APG), Test and Evaluation Command (ATEC), Public Health Command (PHC), 20th Support Command (chemical), Chemical Materials Agency, Medical Research Institute of Chemical Defense (MRICD), and Communications-Electronics Command Life Cycle Management Center (CECLCM). It supports more than 80 tenants, 20 satellite and 17 private activities. The installation provides facilities to perform research, development, testing and evaluation of Army materiel. Facilities include laboratories for research investigations, state-of-the-art ranges, engineering test courses for wheeled and tracked vehicles and a wide variety of research. The installation also supports a wide variety of training, including mechanical maintenance, health promotion and preventive medicine, chemical and biological defense, and chemical casualty care, chemical demilitarization. APG also is host to National Guard and U.S. Army Reserve operations and training. (APG facts, 2013)

APG covers approximately 72,500 acres, more than half of which is water or wetlands. There are about 6,800 acres of improved grounds, nearly 300 miles of road, and roughly 567,000 square yards of airfield pavement. (APG facts, 2013)

APG's facilities include 17 million square feet of building space in over 2,000 buildings (including offices, administrative and training facilities, and warehouses, barracks and family housing). There are more than 40 miles of track, nearly 200 firing positions, eight medical research laboratories, 10 chemical laboratories, two physics laboratories, five human engineering laboratories, a materials research laboratory as well as Phillips Army Airfield and Weide Army Aviation Support Facility (APG facts, 2013).

C. COR SOCIAL NETWORK A

The first contract studied, social network A, is a service contract for scientific and engineering support for the development of instrumentation systems and test facilities, including design, fabrication and evaluation capability, as described in each issued task order. This support needs to be of a quick response nature to solve instrumentation problems without costly delays to high priority test programs. The contract was awarded

August 31, 2006, effective September 1, 2006, and after all option periods have been exercised, expires August 31, 2014. The contract has the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) code, 541330, and has an approximate value of \$188M.

1. Social Network Structure

Social network A consists of four primary members, as illustrated in Figure 6. The PCO, the customer's representative and the COR are all full-time government employees and are all located in different offices at APG. The contractor's representative (director of business operations) is located in another location, not on the installation. The PCO, the customer's representative and the contractor's representative each have their own social network apart from the COR's network.




Figure 6. Graph of Contracting Officer's Representative Social Network A

2. Member Roles and Responsibilities

The PCO of social network A awards new task orders, issues modifications, issues requests for proposals, accepts proposals from the contractor, monitors performance through Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS), answers contracting questions from the contractor and the COR, helps with funding issues and helps to resolve any other contractual problems.

The COR coordinates new requirements, modifications and period of performance (POP) extensions with the requiring activity, contractor and contracting office. The COR is responsible for authorizing payments in Wide Area Work Flow (WAWF) and resolving issues that come up through the performance of the task orders.

The customer's representative, a project manager, works closely with the contractor overseeing the work, answering technical questions about the support tasks and giving guidance on the tasks outlined in the scope of work. The contractor's representative is responsible for the performance of the contract and handling contractual issues.

3. Network Communication

The PCO of social network A communicates with the COR nearly every day because there are so many task orders under this contract. The PCO communicates with the contractor when the need arises to issue new task orders, create modifications and answer questions. Most of the PCO's communication is with the COR and the contractor's representative. The PCO does not communicate with the customer's representative. The PCO monitors the task orders by receiving monthly reports from the COR. Email is the main mode of communication; telephone and face-to-face methods are also used to a lesser degree.

The COR communicates monthly with the customer's representative, whom the COR calls the technical point of contact (TPOC), asking for status input. Additionally, when an invoice is submitted in WAWF, the COR emails the customer's representative for concurrence on payment authorization. Primarily, the COR uses email and telephone

communication with the contractor, the customer's representative and the PCO. Additionally, the COR has occasional face-to-face interaction with the customer's representative.

The customer's representative usually emails or telephones the COR and the contractor's representative about two to three times per month to submit progress reports, review invoices and prepare modifications to the performance work statement. The customer's representative has monthly progress meetings; either by phone or by a face-to-face meeting, with the contractor to review progress and assure the schedule is maintained.

The contractor's representative email or phones the COR daily and communicates weekly with the contracting office. The contractor's representative has occasional face-to-face communication with all members of this network.

D. COR SOCIAL NETWORK B

The second COR studied, social network B, is for a service contract for the Army to collect data on equipment usage, repair parts consumption and manpower requirements during field training exercises, garrison activities, and local training area activities, as well as contingency operations at various locations Contiguous United States (CONUS) and Outside Contiguous United States (OCONUS). Other functions included in this contract include recording inventory, database administration and analysis, management of contractor personnel and travel as necessary to perform the duties outlined in the performance work statement (PWS). This contract was awarded September 16, 2010, with a NAICS code of 518210 and has an approximate value of \$97 million.

1. Social Network Structure

Social network B consists of four primary members, as illustrated in Figure 7. The PCO, the customer's representative and the COR are all full-time government employees and are all located in different offices at APG. The contractor's representative (contracts

manager) is located in another location, not on the installation. The PCO, the customer's representative and the contractor's representative each have their own social network apart from the COR's network.




Figure 7. Graph of Contracting Officer's Representative Social Network B

2. Member Roles and Responsibilities

The PCO of this social network is responsible for contract modifications, issuing new task orders, resolution of payment issues, monitoring the performance of the COR in relation to the tasks prescribed in the COR appointment letter, and any other contractual issues that arise.

The COR is primarily responsible for quality assurance procedures to ensure the contract is executed in accordance with the PWS. Additionally, the COR is responsible for validating vouchers for payment in WAWF.

The customer's representative communicates daily with the COR on programmatic, technical execution and quality issues.

The contractor's representative's function is to make sure contractual and financial actions are completed. Additionally, the contractor's representative speaks with members of the contractor's social network regularly about the status of the contract.

3. Network Communication

The PCO of social network B communicates several times per week with the COR, not only for current contract administrative tasks, but also because the contract is nearing its end and the requirements package is being prepared for the re-compete of the next contract. The PCO shares with the COR how to prepare and submit required documents and to elicit help on required tasks. The PCO communicates on an as-needed basis with the customer's representative and once a week or less with the contractor's representative. The PCO discusses resolution of payments issues and any contractual problems with the contractor's representative, usually about once a week or less. Email and phone calls are the methods of communication between the PCO and all other members of the network.

The COR communicates daily with the contractor's representative in order to facilitate the level of quality called for in the QASP and to deliver data requests and methods to improve data gathering. Daily communication between the COR and the customer's representative is necessary to ensure that program and technical execution happens per the PWS. The COR communicates via email, telephone and face-to-face discussions with both the contractor's representative and the customer's representative. The COR uses email and the telephone to communicate with the PCO.

The customer's representative and the contractor's representative do not communicate. Both of these individuals responded that their primary contact on any issues is the COR.

E. COR SOCIAL NETWORK C

The third network studied, social network C, is for environmental remediation services for six sites at APG, Maryland. This remediation could include addressing any and all unforeseen environmental, explosive, safety, scheduling, and regulatory issues for the cleanup sites at APG that fall under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA). The contractor has the capability and experience to perform, or provide, a wide range of investigative, remedial design, remedial construction, and remediation services required for hazardous substance and waste sites. This contract was awarded April 28, 2011, with an effective date of June 1, 2011 and expires in 10 years. The NAICS code is 562910 and, after all options are awarded, the total contract amount will be \$28M.

1. Social Network Structure

Unlike the previous two networks, social network C only has three primary members within the social network, as depicted in Figure 8. The network still has a PCO and a contractor's representative; the difference in this network is that the COR and the customer's representative are the same individual. The PCO and the customer's representative/COR (hereafter known as COR) are both full-time government employees and are located in different offices at APG. The contractor's representative's office is located within a 10-minute drive of the COR's office, although not on the installation. The PCO and the contractor's representative each have their own social network apart from the COR's social network.




Figure 8. Graph of Contracting Officer's Representative Social Network C

2. Member Roles and Responsibilities

The PCO of this social network inherited this contract when the awarding PCO left the organization. This PCO administers the contract, including issuing contract modifications, resolving payment issues, monitoring the performance of the COR in relation to the tasks prescribed in the COR appointment letter, and dealing with any problems that may arise with the contract or the contractor.

The COR is primarily responsible for quality assurance procedures to ensure the contract is executed in accordance with the PWS. Additionally, the COR is responsible for validating vouchers for payment in WAWF. The COR on this contract has an assistant, a TPOC, who does most of the oversight of the contract in the field, reporting back to the COR.

The contractor's representative speaks daily with the COR and the TPOC about technical, contractual, scope, schedule, budget, evaluation, regulatory interaction, administrative strategy and/or public interaction issues.

3. Network Communication

The PCO of social network C rarely communicates with the COR, maybe twice within the previous six months, about administrative, regulatory or policy issues. The PCO communicates on an as-needed basis with the contractor's representative, such as when issuing contract modifications. PCO commented that the contract is so well run that there are virtually no issues that need the attention of the PCO. Email is the method of communication between the PCO and the other members of the network.

The COR communicates monthly with the PCO by uploading the monthly reports in the Virtual Contracting Enterprise (VCE) COR tool, whereby the PCO can view and approve the reports. Additionally, the COR communicates once per year with the PCO when the next option period is to be exercised. The COR communicates daily with the contractor's representative to help maintain the schedule. The COR, TPOC and the members of the contractor's representative's team meet monthly, with an identified agenda, to review the contract's progress and to resolve any technical or communication-related conflicts. The COR predominately uses email and telephone communication with the contractor's representative; occasionally they will meet face-to-face. The COR communicates via email with the PCO.

The contractor's representative communicates daily with the COR and the TPOC. The contractor's representative does not communicate with the PCO other than to acknowledge receipt of the PCO's emails. Most communication is handled through emails and phone calls, but because of the close proximity to the COR's office, there are multiple opportunities for face-to-face interaction.

F. SOCIAL NETWORK ANALYSIS

Social network A's structure is the traditional network consisting of four members; the PCO, the COR, the customer's representative, and the contractor's

representative. All but the contractor's representative are located on the same installation, although not in the same building. These four members all actively work together to manage the contract successfully. Information is gathered and shared by the COR who acts as the center of the communication matrix.

The COR regularly communicates with each member of the network, contributing to effective contract oversight. The COR and customer's representative share information about the contractor's performance, invoices in WAWF, upcoming PWS and independent government cost estimate (IGCE) documents, and pending contractual issues. The COR and PCO regularly communicate about performance issues, IGCE and PWS questions, clarification of contractor's cost proposals, POP issues, and many other topics as they arise. The COR and the contractor's representative discuss contractual and performance concerns, interpretation of the PWS, and any invoicing problems. The COR is involved in most of the aspects of the successfully performing contract and the network members are aware of the oversight process and requirements.

The COR in social network A is a government civilian employee who has completed the government-mandated COR training. Additionally, this COR has earned a Bachelor of Arts Degree in Contract Administration. The education, the years of COR experience, and that this COR's only duty is to be a COR, has given this COR the tools necessary to successfully oversee the contract.

The make-up of social network B is more complex than that of social network A as this one has four CORs—one primary and three secondary. The secondary CORs report to the primary COR, however, all four perform contract surveillance throughout the United States and also in multiple overseas locations such as Kuwait, Germany, Italy, Afghanistan and islands in the Pacific Ocean. No one COR has an area of specialty, with the exception of the primary COR who also approves invoices in WAWF. The CORs on this contract travel extensively, therefore we were unable to schedule a time to conduct a personal interview.

As seen in social network A, communication mainly revolves around the COR. All four CORs and the customer's representative have daily communication regarding

PWS requirements, contractor performance, and the ‘burn rate’, the amount of money being utilized and remaining on each task order. The primary COR and PCO interact several times a week to discuss task order modifications, the process for creating new task orders, and help on data requests from higher headquarters. These communications are normally by phone or by email as the COR is often on travel. The CORs and contractor’s representative, including members of the contractor’s representative’s social network communicate daily to manage contractual and PWS issues. Because of the frequency of communication, all members of this social network are aware of the oversight functions of this contract. Once again, the COR(s) appear to be the hub of this communication matrix.

Social network B’s four CORs are retired Army Warrant Officers, making them well-qualified to do surveillance on this data collection contract in which data is collected on Army vehicles and equipment. Each COR is a U.S. government employee whose only duty is to be a COR. All have received the mandatory government training and have been performing COR duties for a number of years.

Social Network C is different from the other two networks; the COR is also the customer’s representative, hereafter known just as the COR. Because of this, there are only three members of this network—the PCO, the COR, and the contractor’s representative. As we have seen in the previous two examples, the COR is the center of the communication process.

Most of the communication within this network occurs between the COR and the contractor’s representative. Because of the close, daily working relationship between the two entities, both are very aware of the oversight functions. In fact, the QASP was jointly prepared by the COR and the contractor’s representative. This social network also includes a TPOC, an assistant to the COR, who monitors the contractor’s performance in the field and communicates daily with the COR and the contractor’s representative. The COR communicates occasionally with the PCO, mainly for contractual issues or providing regular updates.

The COR for social network C is a U.S. government employee who has completed all the required COR courses and has been a COR for about a decade. This COR is an environmental engineer who has the knowledge and the experience to successfully oversee the contract.

G. SUMMARY

APG, as described in the first part of this chapter, is a large research and testing installation for the U.S. Army. Many types of services are provided on this base, including the three that were used for our research. The results of the interviews of three very different types of services were included in the second part of the chapter. Finally, in the analysis section of the chapter, we were able to answer the secondary questions presented in Chapter I. Our conclusions regarding our primary question, what effects do attributes of the COR's social network have on surveillance of the service contract, will be addressed in the next chapter.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, AND AREAS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

A. SUMMARY

The principle purpose of this research and analysis is to provide further study for the DoD services acquisition community through the Acquisition Research Program at the Naval Postgraduate School. This study continues recent research in and provides additional analysis for an area neglected by other research in the field, namely the CORs and their social networks. This research focused on the COR's social network of three similar in scale, scope, and dollar value service contracts. A survey questionnaire was given to and received by all significant members of the COR social network and subsequently evaluated. Ultimately, this research is intended to provide insight for and draw conclusions from a critical aspect that has not received research attention and will hopefully move forward the research of the COR's social network with the goal of understanding how to improve contract oversight.

This research is organized by providing an overview of the study and some background discussion of the requirement in Chapter I. The literature review in Chapter II highlights some of the recent relevant research conducted and published by leading agencies within the federal acquisition community regarding services acquisition management and contract oversight. The research methodology for this study is detailed in Chapter III and lays the framework for data collection and analysis. The three social networks used in this study were all based out of the same military installation, Aberdeen Proving Ground. Survey questionnaires were used for interviewing each major social network member as well as for all the follow-up questions contained in Appendix A. Finally, in Chapter IV, the research findings are presented and the social networks are evaluated in order to provide answers to the primary research questions of this study. Recommendations and areas for future study are outlined in the second part of this chapter.

B. CONCLUSION

1. Research Findings

In order to expand on previous research and provide additional data and analysis for the larger study being conducted by our advisor, this study answered the following similar research questions for the social networks studied:

- What is the structure of the COR's social network, and which members are included in it?
- What roles and responsibilities does each member within the network have with regards to the management of the service contract?
- How does communication transpire between each member of the social network, what information is shared, and how often does communication occur?
- What conclusions can be drawn from the analysis of each social network?

Our findings concerning the first question above found both similarities and differences for each of the COR's social networks analyzed. The structure of social network A consists of four primary members, social network B also had four primary members, and Social Network C had only three primary members. While there is a close similarity in the number of primary members making up the social networks there were differences in the number of CORs assigned. Social networks A and C had a single primary COR assigned whereas Social Network B had a total of four CORs assigned, one primary and three alternates that participated in the social network to a lesser degree. The overall number of primary members was similar to that of Judy's research. However, the number of CORs differed as Judy's networks consisted of one, three, and eight CORs. Judy's COR numbers varied based on the complexity and the number of performance locations, with one COR at one single location up to eight CORs at 15 performance locations. Another difference between the networks that we researched is that the single COR of Social Network C is responsible for overseeing work at six separate locations as well as serving in the dual role of COR and customer's representative.

While there are differences in the COR structure, there are a few elements that are similar between the social networks evaluated. The first similarity, as found within Judy's research (Judy, 2012), is that the interests of the government, customer, and

contractor are all represented by members within each social network. The second similarity found is that the PCO, the customer's representative and contractor's representatives each have their own social network apart from the COR's social network with the exception of Social network C where the COR also assumed the role of customer's representative. Third, the physical location of the PCO, customer's representative and COR's of all the three social networks are based at APG, Maryland where all three contracts originated. The PCO, customer's representative, and CORs are all full-time government employees with past experience serving in their respective roles and are located in separate offices at APG. All contractors' representatives within the social networks were located off-base of APG.

For the second question, similar roles and responsibilities were found in our research for the members within the social networks as those observed during Judy's previous study (Judy, 2012). Within all three social networks, the PCO was responsible for administering the contract, monitoring the performance of the COR in relation to the contract, and maintaining overall responsibility for the government's interest. The CORs within the social networks were primarily responsible for quality assurance procedures ensuring the contract is executed in accordance with the PWS. The COR, for each social network, was also found to be responsible for validating payment vouchers in WAWF. The customer's representatives served in the expected role communicating regularly with the COR and contractor's representatives on programmatic, technical execution, and quality issues. The contractor's representatives within all three social networks were responsible for ensuring contractual and financial actions were complete and timely.

While these main roles and responsibilities for members within the social networks were observed, there were some differences. One variance of the COR's roles and responsibilities in our study was found in social network C where the COR also had a TPOC. This TPOC was responsible for performing most of the actual contract oversight in the field, reporting back to the COR. Our findings suggest that having a TPOC overseeing the contractor's performance in the field improved the ability of the COR to oversee technically complex work while performing other COR duties.

Secondly, social network B had a total of four CORs, one primary and three secondary, performing the duties and sharing responsibilities concerned with the role. Having multiple CORs working together on contract performance was seen to allow a division of labor where certain CORs were able to focus on specific tasks such as the WAWF validating function in accordance with contract milestones. In addition, the multiple worldwide locations led to the need for multiple CORs for contract oversight functions.

Lastly, as mentioned above, our research discovered within social network C that the COR serves in the capacity of COR and customer's representative. For this specific social network, our observations did not uncover any problems or deficiencies within the social network consisting of this unique dual role concept.

The survey results, in answer to our third question, clearly depict the COR as the primary information and communication facilitator among each of the social networks researched. Most survey respondents commented that a strong COR with good communication and organizational skills were a vital part of a successful contract. There is a wide variation in the method and frequency of communication between the various members of each social network but it was clear that the COR served to communicate the most among the other members. In social network A, the COR's communication with customer's representative is two to three times a month and daily with the contractor's representative. For social network B, the COR's communication with the customer and contractor's representatives is both daily. The COR's communication in social network C is daily with the contractor's representative and not applicable for customer's representative due to the COR serving in that position as well. So overall, all CORs had daily communications with the contractor's representative. In both social networks A and B, the COR communicated with the PCO daily to several times a week, while the COR of social network C communicated with the PCO only about every six months. The PCO communicated with the contractor's representative on an as-needed-basis with the exception of the PCO in social network B where they communicated once a week or less. The PCO's communication with the customer's representative did not take place in social network A, is as-needed in social network B, and occurs a couple times a year in social

network C. The customer's representative did not communicate with the contractor with the exception of social network C where the customer's representative was also a COR.

Communication within the three social networks studied shared elements that we believe contribute to the success of overall contract management and oversight. As mentioned in the discussion above, the close proximity of all government personnel within the social network at APG facilitated frequent communication. Communication methods varied, in order of frequency from email, phone, face-to-face, meetings, or online via the VCE COR tool or in WAWF. Email was the standard desired communication method for all social network members since it provided a historical record for reference if ever necessary for review in solving any contract issues or problems. The only exception for the primary method of communication being email is for the four CORs working in the same office of social network B. Due to ease of access for these members performing duties at the same time in the same location, in-person communication takes place more often among themselves. After reviewing our survey responses from all individuals within each social network, we have seen similarities in the high level of communication between the COR and other social network members. This high level allows the social network members an opportunity to solve contractual issues and questions before they become contractual problems thereby contributing to successful contract oversight.

In answering the fourth question, our research and analysis of the COR social network participants reached similar conclusions to that of previous research conducted (Judy, 2012). From the questionnaire responses submitted by members of the three social networks, there were some key ingredients for contract oversight success. These elements are the frequency of communication within each network, past experience and competency of the CORs, and workload dedication to COR duties.

For the first essential element of communication, there was significant evidence that the high frequency of communication and interaction among the members of all three networks is the leading contributing factor for the successful contract oversight and quality of service provided to the government. In all three networks, the CORs communicated with the contractor's representative multiple times per week and, in some

cases, daily. The CORs' stance is that the frequent communication provides opportunities to address, and the contractor to correct, any issues before they become problems. Since none of the three social networks analyzed were deemed to be dysfunctional or had oversight issues, we were unable to observe if a low level of communication among the COR social network was a contributing factor to the resultant poor contract oversight. Needless to say, our interviews with each of the four members of three social networks did point to the conclusion that regular communication among each member in the respective COR social network reduced or minimized any problems that arose before becoming a major issue and that the COR was the primary individual among each social network facilitating that communication.

The second key essential element, that of the past experience and competency of each COR, was crucial for achieving positive results. Our analysis of the social networks highlighted that each COR had served as a COR on a previous contract. In addition to the local mandatory certification and Defense Acquisition University (DAU) training necessary to assume the role of COR, it was evident that past experience allowed for smooth operation of their day-to-day duties. While not necessarily required, the results of our interviews whereby the CORs of the three social networks have previously served as CORs on multiple contracts, showed that a COR having past experience made for a competent COR for all the social networks we evaluated and resulted in effective and efficient contract oversight.

Finally, the third key element, having a dedicated COR working exclusively in that role, contributed to high performance. In each of the COR social networks, the person assigned to the role of COR did not have any additional duties or responsibilities. While the COR of social network C had a dual role of COR and customer's representative, the less complex nature of this contract allowed him complete oversight. For each COR, their primary and sole job was in performing the duties of a COR for the contract assigned. In fact, one of the COR social networks evaluated had four dedicated CORs—one primary and three secondary—to perform the various duties in overseeing the contractor's performance. According to the interviewed CORs, there are a vast number of tasks associated with being a COR, including checking work being performed

at various locations on and off the installation and monitoring performance milestones. Therefore, having an individual dedicated to the role of COR allows that person sufficient time to properly assist the contracting officer in managing and ensuring proper contract performance.

2. Recommendations

When comparing our observations and interviews with the members of the social networks we chose, the information that we collected seemed to be consistent to those found in the Naval Postgraduate School research paper “An Empirical Study of the Social Network of the Contracting Officer’s Representative” (Judy, 2012), and as such, we concur with the three recommendations presented within that paper. The recommendations as presented were that CORs be selected based on their experience and technical knowledge; that CORs have their primary duties assigned strictly to those of overseeing the contracts; and that communication lines are kept open between all parties involved.

In addition to the three presented in the previous study, we also recommend that at a minimum, regular monthly meetings are held and include the COR, the contractor, and the end user in order to discuss topics related to the PWS. When the meetings include contractual requirements or changes, the PCO would also be included in the meetings. These meetings should be face-to-face or conducted via telephone or video teleconference (VTC). By conducting a live meeting through one of these outlets, collaboration and feedback are instant. The intent of these meetings would be to address any problems or concerns as early as possible and make a concerted effort to preempt any issues that may arise. In addition to addressing potential problems, these monthly meetings allow for all parties to remain abreast of the performance of the contract.

C. AREAS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

In an effort to expand on the upon the Naval Postgraduate School research paper “An Empirical Study of the Social Network of the Contracting Officer’s Representative” (Judy, 2012), we examined three additional COR social networks from a single branch of the military, the Army, and all three networks resided on one military installation. The

research that we conducted included different contract service types (science and engineering, data collection, and environmental remediation) than those previously examined (food service and aircraft maintenance) as well, offering a broader view of the social networks of CORs. We propose that future research continue to expand upon the types of services contracts studied. Additionally, as was suggested by Judy, we also propose that future research of COR social networks should be broadened including the Navy and the Marine Corps, in addition to studying contracts at other military installations. Other areas of research we propose are:

- semantics; which components of language within the communication channels leads to greater success in contract management and, conversely, which ones do not,
- the level of involvement of the PCO with the COR in managing and overseeing contracts, and
- the quality and amount of training of the CORs by various service agencies (e.g., Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps).

While our research focused on three successfully managed contracts, there would be added benefit to studying contracts with performance issues or other deficiencies within the social network. We reiterate that an expansion of research is needed to further confirm or dispute the findings of the studies.

APPENDIX A. INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Potential Interview Questions Including but not Limited to:

Contracting Officer:

1. What is your role with regards to this service contract?
2. Who are your primary contacts in regards to this service contract?
3. Who communicates with you in regards to this service contract?
4. How often do you communicate with each of these people (daily, 3-4 times a week, 1 time a week, 2-3 times a month, once a month, quarterly, when the need arises)?
5. What means of communication do you use with each of these people (i.e. in person, telephone, email)?
6. What reasons do you communicate with each of these people?
7. What types of information do you share with each of these people?
8. Is there a published plan on how and when communication should occur with each of these people?
9. Do you file or store a record of communication with any of these people for historical reference? If so how are you storing these records?
10. How do you monitor the status of the service contract?
11. What monitoring / surveillance of the contractor are you aware of?
12. Is it based on the Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan or something else?
13. Is there any additional information you would like to include in this research relevant to communication within this social network?

Contracting Officer Representative:

1. What is your role with regards to this service contract?
2. Who are your primary contacts in regards to this service contract?
3. How often do you communicate with each of these people (daily, 3-4 times a week, 1 time a week, 2-3 times a month, once a month, quarterly, when the need arises)?
4. What means of communication do you use with each of these people (i.e. in person, telephone, email)?
5. What reasons do you communicate with each of these people?
6. What types of information do you share with each of these people?

7. What point in the service contract's lifecycle were you appointed as the COR?
8. What training did you receive to perform your duties as the COR?
9. How is your performance as a COR monitored?
10. How do you monitor the status of the service contract?
11. What surveillance is conducted on the contractor?
12. Do you have a Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan you use when monitoring the contract? If not what document do you use?
13. Is there any additional information you would like to include in this research relevant to communication within this social network?

Customer Receiving Service

1. Who are your primary contacts in regards to this service contract?
2. Who communicates with you in regards to this service contract?
3. How often do you communicate with each of these people (daily, 3-4 times a week, 1 time a week, 2-3 times a month, once a month, quarterly, when the need arises)?
4. What means of communication do you use with each of these people (i.e. in person, telephone, email)?
5. What reasons do you communicate with each of these people?
6. What types of information do you share with each of these people?
7. How do you monitor the status of the service contract?
8. What monitoring / surveillance of the contractor are you aware of?
9. Is it based on the Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan or something else?
10. Is there any additional information you would like to include in this research relevant to communication within this social network?

Contractor Providing Service

1. Who are your primary contacts in regards to this service contract?
2. Who communicates with you in regards to this service contract?
3. How often do you communicate with each of these people (daily, 3-4 times a week, 1 time a week, 2-3 times a month, once a month, quarterly, when the need arises)?
4. What means of communication do you use with each of these people (i.e. in person, telephone, email)?
5. What reasons do you communicate with each of these people?
6. What types of information do you share with each of these people?

7. How do you monitor the status of the service contract?
8. Do you think communication is helping with performance of the service contract?
9. What monitoring / surveillance of the contractor are you aware of?
10. Is it based on the Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan or something else?
11. Is there any additional information you would like to include in this research relevant to communication within this social network?

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

APPENDIX B. COR SOCIAL NETWORK A INTERVIEWS

Procuring Contracting Officer, Social Network A:

1. What is your role with regards to this service contract?
Contracting Officer
2. Who are your primary contacts in regards to this service contract?
Contracting Officer's Representative (COR), Contractor—Director of Business Operations
3. You don't mention the end users. Do you ever talk to the end users.
The COR is our end user. No I do not talk to the end user. One of the end users...I think this is the first time I've met him as we're working on the re-compete. We go right through the COR, who takes care of everything. If she has a question, she comes to us to ask it and we get back to her. And she goes back to the end user. My supervising contracting officer is pulled in a lot on this also.
4. You are the KO now. Did another KO used to be?
There have been a number of KOs on here because of us moving around, different divisions and stuff like that. My branch chief and, a lot of times if I'm not here, she'll sign. Just about any Contracting Officer can sign but it's mainly my branch chief because we try to keep the number of people signing down. We don't want it going out to a lot of different people because they're not familiar with the contract.
5. You inherited this contract, you were not the one who award it or set it up. About how long have you been administering this one?
Maybe 4 years
6. Who communicates with you in regards to this service contract?
COR and Contractor—Director of Business Operations.
7. How often do you communicate with each of these people (daily, 3–4 times a week, 1 time a week, 2-3 times a month, once a month, quarterly, when the need arises)?
*When the need arises. The contractor does call from time to time and when he's in the area, he likes to stop by and just to see how things are going, to check in.
I get COR reports monthly The CPARS report is weekly. But that is for all the contracts that I have. I send the list out to the CORs weekly because task orders end a various times and there's always a CPARS that needs to be completed. We have a report for ones that are coming up within the next month or two. One a single task order, the CPARS is yearly and only at the end of it. With this company, there's so many task orders. So I have contact with my CORs pretty much daily. But weekly, mainly, we put those reports out.*

8. What means of communication do you use with each of these people (i.e. in person, telephone, email)?
Person, email, telephone. Use email the most.
9. Mostly for documentation?
Somewhat. But most of the time it's just questions coming through or if they want a quick answer, they'll call me.
10. What reasons do you communicate with each of these people?
Funding, Tasks, issues, CPARS that are due.
11. Do you have a lot of WAWF issues, is that what you mean by funding?
Not a whole lot, although sometimes we do get CDRs because of General Fund Enterprise Business System (GFEBS). GFEBS has created some problems.
12. What types of information do you share with each of these people?
Pretty much everything: modifications, proposals, performance.
13. Contract issues, if something's not going well, you hear about it. Do ever hear when something is going well?
I don't hear anything when it's going well. Usually, it's going bad, cost proposals, if they're questioning something then the contractor putting together their cost proposal, then we'll go back and talk to them about it. There are problems, there currently are problems with the contractor, we have been talking with them a lot lately.
14. Is there a published plan on how and when communication should occur with each of these people?
Yes, the monthly reports.
15. Do you file or store a record of communication with any of these people for historical reference? If so how are you storing these records?
If the need arises. COR Reports, modifications to include Memorandum for Records. Records filed in COR Web tool, Paperless Contract File (PCF), and hard paper file, and computer hard drives.
16. You still have hard paper copy files of this contract. It's being phased out. Is the old stuff going to be uploaded into PCF?
Not the real old stuff. I think currently we only had to go back to the beginning of fiscal year 2012. When we first started it was a smaller window than that, then we got everything in, then they changed it and said 'ok, let's go back to this date, and put it all in' and they haven't come back saying we had to go past that date yet.
17. How do you monitor the status of the service contract?
COR Web tool, telephone conversations, emails.
18. What monitoring / surveillance of the contractor are you aware of?
QASP

19. I noticed that it seems like the QASP is pretty sparse as far as today's standards.
Yes, it is.
20. But it still functions? Do you think the COR has added to the QASP without it actually being written down?
Yes. She probably has. I would think she probably does a little extra over what is written down for what she's putting in her reports to us. But a lot of times her reports, if there's not a problem, it's pretty standard.
21. I noticed on the new re-compete, the QASP is very different. I guess that's 7 years' worth of experience and directives coming down from ACC, it would have to change.
A lot of changes within the last couple of years. We are all relearning how to do our jobs.
22. Is it based on the Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan or something else?
QASP
23. Is there any additional information you would like to include in this research relevant to communication within this social network?
Years ago, with the CORs...currently, the CORs have too many contracts under them to be able to watch over them effectively. They need to be given a manageable amount.

Contracting Officer Representative, Social Network A:

1. What is your role with regards to this service contract?
I am the COR for the contract. I coordinate new requirements, modifications, and POP extensions with the requiring activity, contractor, and contracting office. I am responsible for authorizing payments in WAWF and resolving issues that come up through the performance of the task orders.
2. Who are your primary contacts in regards to this service contract?
The technical POCs for the task orders, contract administrator, contracting officer, Director of Business Operations, onsite Project Manager.
3. I don't see where you talk to the end users in that response.
I call my end users the Technical POCs, whoever is the person who has requested a task on the contract is my go-to person for that particular task from that point out. Now it may be that that person is representing someone else, for instance, we had a build for black boxes that was for another organization that came to us and said Can we support them in this test and we said yes and to support them in this test, we had to get this instrumentation built. So one of the customer's representatives was the POC for that so he's the one I dealt with, I never dealt with the other organization. Only with the customer point of contact.

4. So your Technical POCs would be for each task order you had separate ones.
Yes, absolutely.
5. How often do you communicate with each of these people (daily, 3-4 times a week, 1 time a week, 2-3 times a month, once a month, quarterly, when the need arises)?
Communication is on an as needed basis
6. Do you not speak with those task order people monthly, to get like a monthly report or anything like that?
I email and ask for the monthly report, I think that's later on when I refer to the monthly reports, but yes I need to get their input and feedback for the monthly reports and whenever there is an invoice that comes up in WAWF, cause I need to get them to look at it and let me know if it's acceptable and authorized to pay. Generally, unless there is an issue, I'm not after them and they're not after me for things. Obviously, whenever something's going on, on their particular task, there's a lot more interaction. And those times happen whenever they might want to establish a task on the contract and we have to discuss what I need from them as far as Statement of Work, an IGCE, and so forth. Whenever a POP needs extended, whenever they want to mod it, whenever they're have some kind of problem that they did or did not include in the monthly report. If there are issues with items coming in on a timely manner, as far as, if bills are being made, for instance, instrumentation, we're expecting it to come in at a certain rate and they're not, they are going to get with me and we may then do as we are doing now, a little more scrutiny of the DD250s and making sure really what's...a lot more interaction between them and me.
7. In your position here, do you go to the field to see any of the things that you're doing?
Rarely.
8. Is that a time issue?
Not really, I depend on the Technical POCs to be my eyes and ears, the same way I'm the eyes and ears for the contracting officer, I expect him or her to do that for me and that's what the reports, that's how we did the QASP. The QASP, from today's standards, it's pretty loosey-goosey.
9. Yes, we noticed that when we were looking at it. If you were to do the QASP today, you would definitely change the way you would have done it?
I would be required to change it. It would be much more stringent, not only in the reporting requirement but also the surveillance, I'm sure. And how that surveillance is going to be done other than the Technical POCs will keep the COR apprised of what's happening.

10. What means of communication do you use with each of these people (i.e., in person, telephone, email)?
All three means of communication are used for tech POCs. Primarily telephone and email for communication with contracting office personnel and Director of Business Operations. Primarily email and in person communication with project manager. Occasional, as needed, in person communication with Director of Business Operations and contracting.
11. When you have a phone call, do you then follow it up with an email or does your end user follow up with an email to document things? How do you document those phone calls?
Sometimes I do and sometimes I don't. I probably don't document the phone calls as well as I should.
12. What reasons do you communicate with each of these people?
- *Tech POCs—Discuss task requirements (new efforts and modifications, including POPs), provide Statement of Work (SOW) and IGCE templates, input for invoice verifications, input for monthly reports to contracting office, status updates, respond to financial questions, issues with contractor performance or quality, response to contractor proposals, cost/price concerns*
 - *Contracting—resolve issues with performance or quality, monthly reports, answer IGCE and SOW questions, response to contractor proposals, cost/price concerns and impact on future use of the contract, guidance on furlough issues, guidance on any gray areas in regards to contract – relay upcoming requirements (heads-up copies of SOWs), clarification of cost proposals, resolution of POP issues, resolution of quality/performance issues, respond to contractor questions, relay applicable furlough information, respond to requests for civilian contractor IDs and security badge applications, interpretation of SOWs, cost/price concern resolutions*
13. Your Contracting Officer interaction, you said was mainly for if you do mods or anything like that where there are specific problems that they handle, so you don't, as again, as needed. You don't talk a lot to the contracting officer?
Only if I have questions or problems and if there's something that I feel like I don't know if I should be discussing this with the contractor, I call and either, and usually for those questions, I'll talk to the contracting officer. If it's more along the lines of POPs or some things we need to get straightened in the contract or crossing some Ts and dotting some Is, then I'll talk with the contract specialist, cause she's the one who's the administrator. But if it's something that I feel like I need a real good answer on, if I'm feeling a little uneasy about something, I may want to ask the contractor or what they have asked me, what can I tell them, that kind of thing, I talk to contracting officer.

14. Just look at the two task orders with customer's representative, the traffic control one, tell me about just that task order, the interaction between you as COR and him as end user.
Communication, both by email and by phone, I'm an oldy, so I like to talk to people, I find that email is great for documentation and all that, but I like the give-and-take, the ask a question-get-an-answer, if that brings up another question, I can get things going so I do, unless it's very cut-and-dry, I'm likely to give a phone call. Communication-wise, I think that we are able to work well together, I try not to leave people hanging and I don't think I've left the customer hanging or anything...I'm not sure what you are asking.
15. I asked him how often he talks to the COR, what is the contents of those conversations, that's where I'm going with my question. How do you see the interaction between you two?
The interaction, I don't think it's much different from generally. I don't generally bug, if you want to use those words, the technical POCs, the end users, unless there's some issue thatI don't usually go to them unless I need some information. I don't just touch base to touch base.
16. That's pretty much what the customer's representative said too. I guess in a contract like the contractor, it seems to be that it runs pretty well, it's a pretty evenly run contract.
And when it doesn't, that's when things bubble up. And we have had things bubbling up over this past year and it involved quality and timing issues on delivery of instrumentation. And it bubbled up to the front office, and it has meant a lot of face-to-face meetings that, if you had been doing this study 18 months ago, I would have said I hardly ever see anybody face-to-face. But this has meant some of the higher-ups at the contractor coming in and basically making nice with the Colonel and the technical director and it has led to, I believe, more meetings between, just from a standpoint of, tying down what our requirements really are. And that's part of the problem here was perhaps not defining our requirements as well as we should have.
17. I noticed in the original base contract, even the PWS, seemed pretty vague.
Well it almost has to be 'cause we don't know what we are going to be doing. We can broadly say instrumentation to support automotive testing but until that comes in, you don't know what you are going to be building.
18. So that's why you have to be very specific on each task order.
And more so now because, as of about a year or so ago, we had to go to...we lost the capability of using the time and materials portion for this contract. This was a mixed time and materials/firm fixed price so it had to go firm fixed price which ties our hands somewhat, and it's very frustrating for some of the people here because instrumentation development division, that's what we develop, we don't necessarily know

what you want until you work through designs, do some testing and all, and in a firm fixed price environment, that's really hard to write your PWS for that because who knows? And that has been part of the problem that we ran into.

19. That sounds like your bubbling up problem arose about the same time that it switched from T&M to firm fixed price.

Actually it bubbled up later. What happened was, the biggest problem was, getting some instrumentation made and the statement of Work that we had was "black box with mountable display unit and associated cable". It was well established what the black box was. The mountable display unit was something that was a COTS item. The cable was discussed between the product manager and the people here and everybody here thought they understood what they wanted because they even sent back drawings saying 'this is what we're going to give you' and we said 'fine, that's great'. Well, when the delivery came, what we got was the cable that was already attached to, as part of the display unit that did not fit into the piece of instrumentation because it was just a commercial cable and they said 'that's the associated cable'. I said 'I'm sorry, it's not'. 'Well, we didn't plan for any more than that', 'Yes you did, we talked about this, you had connector part numbers'. But it came down to with associated cable is too vague, it really was, it should have been well-documented what that meant. So what it boiled down to was, we allowed them to, with the money that they had which wasn't enough to build the cables, but it was enough to get the parts for the cables. "Go out and get the parts and we'll build our own cables". But that's the kind of communication problems that we've kind of run into and that would have had nothing to do with it being firm fixed price. It had to do with just a poorly written statement of work. Now the issues we've had before it really bubbled up were timing issues of getting things in on time, them not ordering things, long lead time items, in time to make the POP and asking for extensions. Saying 'it took longer than expected'. Well, we found out that if they had ordered them when they knew they needed them, it would have been plenty of time but it's all this...

20. As a KO, I would ask for evidence of when they ordered it. Did your KO do that?

Well, we went as far as asking them for consideration and the Colonel got into it, and it went, the Colonel was involved, it was all this stuff. And they decided they, the front office, decided they are going to give them one more chance to make good, we're gonna let them off so we did not pursue the consideration. And since then, that's when all these meetings have happened, everyone's making sure that the organization is happy. So that has led to a lot more communication, at a higher level than I am.

21. But you are included in everything?
No, I'm not but that's alright. I get... the contractor...tends to go straight to, they make their pitch to the Colonel and the technical director and my director to get involved. Then it's filtered down to me what the outcome is going to be.
22. So instead of the contractor coming to you to tell you what their beef is they go directly to the Colonel.
It's not really their beef, their beef is that want us to give them more work. And what they are doing is they are pitching how much better they're doing now, that they should be sending more work their way, is kind of what they are doing. They are marketing themselves, is really what they are doing. And this contract had in the past and in the contract previous to this one, we had allowed Natick, the soldier center up in Massachusetts, to utilize this contract to a great degree to get some of their force provider stuff done. And we had told them a couple years ago, them being Natick, they needed to find another contract vehicle that C4 mission was growing here at our organization, we needed to keep the cost ceiling of the contract for us and not for someone else. Well, we have not utilized the contract to the cost ceiling since then, which the contractor thinks is just terrible and they should be getting, so they've been pushing for Natick to continue to use the contract and we've been saying 'no' and that's one of the things they push to the Colonel every now and then.
23. So a lot of your communication has been in the recent time-frame, much of it having to do with the amount of work, delivery problems, both items being delivered and Period of Performance. Is that right?
Yes, the recent past. Within the last year.
24. So, a lot of phone calls and emails
Yes, internally and to contracting and to the contractor, as well.
25. What types of information do you share with each of these people?
- *Tech POCs—contractual, requirements, financials, any info relating to their requirements and the contract in general*
 - *Contracting Office—any info relating to the contract, contractor, the organization's concerns about the contractor*
 - *Contractor—info relating to contract, performance concerns, interpretation of SOWs, cost/price concerns, invoice problems/issues*
26. What point in the service contract's lifecycle were you appointed as the COR?
Appointed at the time of award of the base contract
27. What training did you receive to perform your duties as the COR?
All mandated government training. Online coursework at a university leading to a BA in Business Administration with concentration in Contract Administration.

28. How is your performance as a COR monitored?
Contracting office and supervisor
29. How do you monitor the status of the service contract?
Spreadsheets for awards, pending actions, financials, and task list
30. What surveillance is conducted on the contractor?
Tech POCs are responsible for surveilling the contractor's progress and reporting to me on a monthly basis.
31. In contracting, we are taught that the COR should be out in the field doing surveillance. That's one of the reasons I ask you if you ever get out there. Yet you are telling me that you let your technical POCs tell you if there's a problem.
Generally, now a lot of my technical POCs are here, they're ITT people. They're testing the instrumentation that has come in or they're using the instrumentation that has come in so I hear from them if there's a problem.
32. They are within this building?
Yes.
33. And that makes it easy for them to come and see you.
Yes. And it makes it easy for me to walk over and say 'Hey is there a problem. I'm hearing things, What's up? Is there something I need to be aware of?'
34. So you also have some face-to-face interaction, too.
Yes, with a lot of the technical POCs
35. Do you have a Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan you use when monitoring the contract? If not what document do you use?
We have a QASP, but it is very general.
36. I saw that it is very general. From 2006, when that was written, to now, that would be a huge difference in a QASP
Oh yeah, I guess that a development of contracting, how things are being improved, although improved is a relative term
37. Is there any additional information you would like to include in this research relevant to communication within this social network?
I really appreciate having a contracting officer who is willing to give me the time when I have the questions that I have, to help me out. Because I've had the other situation on other contracts and its...
38. Where the KO doesn't respond?
Yes. Or I don't know who the KO is because somebody left and I'm sending emails and three months later someone says 'oh, she's gone' and nobody told me. Who's the new KO on my contract? Been on the maintenance contract side but it's been a problem over the years
39. So there's been a lack of communication from the contracting office to you, on occasion.

On occasion. But on this contract, I deal with a contracting office that I've always found them very helpful. The ones that are not so helpful, to get information out of, are another contracting office.

Customer Receiving the Service, Social Network A

1. What is your position with the organization?
I am the project manager representing the organization, representing the customer.
2. Who are your primary contacts in regards to this service contract?
COR for the Engineering Support contract with the contractor
3. Do you ever speak directly to the contractor?
Oh, yes, all the time.
4. What capacity do the people at the contractor serve as?
With the contractor, I work with them closely with the oversight of the work and also the day-to-day progress, not day-to-day progress, but the detailed progress of the support tasks at hand as well as working with the individuals that perform the work required in the scope of work. I deal and talk with multiple people from the contractor. Usually it's the program manager, the primary initial point of contact.
5. Do you give them direction?
If they have specific technical questions in nature relative to what's outlined in the scope of work, I'll answer those types of questions. Give them guidance, if you will.
6. So they come and ask you?
Yes.
7. Who communicates with you in regards to this service contract?
The COR
8. How often do you communicate with each of these people (daily, 3-4 times a week, 1 time a week, 2-3 times a month, once a month, quarterly, when the need arises)?
Two to three times per month
9. The communications with the contractor, how often are they happening? Is that a daily thing?
No. Not daily. Probably the same frequency, about two to three times per month.
10. What means of communication do you use with each of these people (i.e. in person, telephone, email)?
Email and telephone usually. On rare occasions in person at a meeting
11. What reasons do you communicate with each of these people?

Submit progress reports, review invoices, prepare modifications to the SOW

12. What types of information do you share with each of these people?
How the Engineering support work is progressing, good bad, problems etc. Also how we are doing financially....do we have sufficient funds to complete the work? Is the billing amounts/hours reasonable for the amount of work performed each month?

13. You are telling us that you give the contractor some additional guidance and direction when they ask. But do you ever, if you see they aren't doing something right or you don't think that's what the Scope of Work says, do you stop them or do you call the COR and ask her to stop them? Or may be redirect them?

I don't believe that has ever happened to date, with the contractor's contract where they've gone off in the wrong direction or have done something that I was not intending them to do and I attribute that a lot to our monthly progress meetings, just to stay on course. As far as, keeping on track, keeping on the right direction, that's handled directly with the contractor, with our monthly progress meetings.

14. Does the COR come to those monthly progress meetings?

No. I think the COR is quite busy with overseeing and handling the other 10,15,20 delivery orders with the contractor, not to mention her other work to devote one or two hours every month to the delivery order.

Which sort of flies in the face of what we've been taught, that the COR is to be involved in every aspect of the contract and what I'm hearing you say is she doesn't come to the meetings, she is busy. And CORs often have so much paperwork to do that they don't get out in the field like they are supposed to. From what we are taught, the COR should be at the meetings, should be communicating with the contractor, and you as the end user.

15. How do you monitor the status of the service contract?

I have monthly meetings with the contractor's personnel, either telephonically or in person to review progress and assure schedule is maintained. I also review and approve/disapprove the monthly billing invoices.

16. What monitoring / surveillance of the contractor are you aware of?

I believe COR compares the progress reports from the contractor with those from the customers (me) for each Delivery Order. The COR also relies on feedback from the customer to assure work is being performed in a timely manner.

17. Do you do any of that review, as well?

The way the COR deals with that is that she asks for a progress report from the contractor. She also asks for one from me. As a courtesy, after

the contractor's and mine are submitted, she will send me the contractor's progress report just as a courtesy information and that, in essence, gives her and me a second look at the accuracy of those progress reports. She also sends me the monthly invoices so that she has a comfort level in approving or questioning any charges that are billed to the Government every month.

18. Is it based on the Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan or something else?
Not sure...
19. You're not sure what that Quality assurance Surveillance Plan is?
Yes, and that might be something that the COR does or has done and I'm just not aware of.
20. So you don't know what standards she's expecting? What level of effort or work does she expect? 100 percent compliance, 90 percent compliance? Whatever it is, but you are not aware of what that is?
Correct, I would have a standard of 100 percent compliance. The COR may have that and I have just not seen it. Or it may be buried in the 20-30 pages of delivery order documentation that...
21. Or it may be in the base contract that you have never seen?
That's correct.
22. Is there any additional information you would like to include in this research relevant to communication within this social network?
Not at this time. All my dealings with the contractor have been good as they have been with the COR. In the two or three years that I have been doing this with the contractor, there has only been one issue and it had nothing to do with the contractor or with the COR's work, it was another group within the organization that raised an issue which threw a wrench. But nothing that interfered with the communication with the three parties.

Contractor providing service, Social Network A:

1. Who are your primary contacts in regards to this service contract?
COR, KO and Contract Specialist
2. Who communicates with you in regards to this service contract?
COR, KO and Contract Specialist
3. How often do you communicate with each of these people (daily, 3–4 times a week, 1 time a week, 2–3 times a month, once a month, quarterly, when the need arises)?
 - *COR---almost daily*
 - *Contract Specialist—one time a week*
 - *KO—quarterly*

4. What means of communication do you use with each of these people (i.e. in person, telephone, email)?
phone/email/in-person
5. What reasons do you communicate with each of these people?
 - *COR—programmatic admin reasons*
 - *Contract Specialist and KO—contractual reasons*
6. What types of information do you share with each of these people?
COR---programmatic admin info
Contract Specialist and KO—contractual info
7. How do you monitor the status of the service contract?
We do this in several ways. We have program managers who have the overall responsibility for monitoring the progress and controlling costs. We assign program controllers who monitor costs on a monthly basis and prepare monthly status reports. We track all deliveries on a master delivery chart. We meet once a month at the Divisional level and report full job status to management.
8. Do you think communication is helping with performance of the service contract?
Communication is of the utmost importance in assuring good performance on the contract. The government counterparts that I deal with have always been very communicative with me and pleasant to work with.
9. What monitoring / surveillance of the contractor are you aware of?
I do know that the COR monitors completion dates, progress and costs where applicable in conjunction with her government program managers.
10. Is it based on the Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan or something else?
I am not aware.
11. Is there any additional information you would like to include in this research relevant to communication within this social network?
None at this time.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

APPENDIX C. COR SOCIAL NETWORK B INTERVIEWS

Procuring Contracting Officer, Social Network B:

1. What is your role with regards to this service contract?
Contract Specialist on this one. The value is \$96M so it's going to go to my boss, who will be the KO for this.
2. Who are your primary contacts in regards to this service contract?
COR and contractor's contracts manager
3. Do you every talk with anyone else about it?
Yes, the COR obviously is my primary contact. But I also talk to the program manager for the organization.
4. He would be considered the end user?
Yes, that's correct.
5. Yet, COR is the end user also?
He's the COR for the day-to-day. If you put a government face to the program, it's program manager. The COR has been delegated with the responsibility for the day-to-day contract administration tasks.
6. Who communicates with you in regards to this service contract?
The COR and contractor's contract manager
7. How often do you communicate with each of these people (daily, 3-4 times a week, 1 time a week, 2-3 times a month, once a month, quarterly, when the need arises)?
COR: Daily, Contractor, weekly +/- . I talk with the COR every day, largely because of where we are with the timeline of this contract. The existing contract is coming to an end. We're obviously very involved in getting the requirement re-solicited and out for proposals so that is probably three fourths of the discussion right now. The existing contract, we still discuss but that's probably once a week. The contractor also, that's my role. I'm a conduit basically, between the two sides. The COR will say 'We need a modification to this aspect of the statement of work'. I work with him getting that statement of work revised, the exact revisions in place and turn it around and have to send it to get the contractor to review it and put a price on it and come back. One's related to the other the amount of interaction that I have.
8. What means of communication do you use with each of these people (i.e. in person, telephone, email)?
Email and phone
9. What reasons do you communicate with each of these people?
Modifications, new task orders, planning follow on contract

10. What types of information do you share with each of these people?
COR-how to prepare and submit required documents ie. PWS, IGCE, service contract approval.
Contractor: resolution of payment issues once they've submitted the invoices, for one reason or another, Defense Finance and Accounting Service (DFAS) has not paid the contractor. Ordinarily it's a simple issue, the way the likely and properly submitted the invoice, used the wrong Contract Line Item Number (CLIN), etc., which is common throughout and contracting, not just this one. That is the preponderance of the contractor-generated interactions I have. Hey I didn't get paid, sometime they'll check to see 'did you guys receive our proposal' and try to find out if there are any issues, things like that for either a new task order or modification to an existing task order.
11. Is there a published plan on how and when communication should occur with each of these people?
No. It wouldn't be possible
12. Do you file or store a record of communication with any of these people for historical reference? If so how are you storing these records?
Emails retained
13. With phone calls with the COR; do you take notes?
No, I don't, largely because of what we do is follow up phone calls if there's any deliverables or do-outs or things we've agreed on the follow-up to the phone call or I'll follow-up with a phone call to remind them, then there is a record and they say 'just file the email' in my own records by contract number, by task order number.
14. You follow-up by email or by phone call?
If there's phone call initiating an action, we will follow up with an email, say 'hey, you have to give me certain reports, do-outs, taskers that are driven by the draw-down in Afghanistan, then I have to respond, it's going to fall on the COR, I don't have time to get the information to answer the tasker, it's obviously at the COR level. I'll just call the COR and say 'hey, I've got something that I need your input on, I've got a week that I have to forward it up, I'll send it to you' and I'll send it to him, 'here's what I was talking about' with a follow-up to make sure we hit the suspense date..
15. How do you monitor the status of the service contract?
Formal tracking is the COR monthly report that they submit on each active task order; there are currently four active task orders on this contract. Also, because of the thresholds, this contract is subject to CPARS so we get the annual evaluations. The aspects of the contract with performance with that. That's the formal. As kind of an informal... the scope of this contract being global in nature, literally, most of the installations where there's a high density of Amy equipment, generators,

aircraft, combat vehicles, the Army has task monitors that are overseeing the contractor's performance at all these locations. Out there collecting the data and reporting that up and eventually that's all compiled here at APG by the organization.

16. Does the COR go to spot-check, like in Afghanistan?
Largely, that's what he does. The COR is on every one of the visits. One or more of his colleagues, just to give him a greater coverage. We'll schedule out and do reviews on-site with contractor and their task monitor as a managerial control over the contract. Just about everyone in the COR's office are retired Army Warrant Officers, a CW5, so it's nothing new to them. They know exactly what to expect because they spent careers in the Army where this work is being done.
17. What monitoring / surveillance of the contractor are you aware of?
Task monitors at CONUS/OCNUS locations feed data back to the organization, APG
18. Other OCONUS locations besides Afghanistan?
Right, Kuwait, Germany, Italy, in the Pacific. It is truly global. The reason's the Army's collection data on their equipment and doing analysis under all sorts of conditions, wherever Army equipment is likely to be deployed, anywhere.
19. While the COR was gone, like when he went to Afghanistan, did you have communication while he was there?
He has called pretty much at every stop on this trip but that is largely due to the status on the new requirement. He's not calling to report anything, it only becomes in my lane if it's an issue of the contractor is either unwilling or unable to perform to the statement of work. Or there's a question, which there hasn't been, but if he sees one cropping up, it's something in the scope of the contract, but we're three years in to the performance of the contract so out of those, questions were pretty much resolved on the first couple of months.
20. Is it based on the Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan or something else?
QASP, performance based acquisition
21. There's no change to the QASP, the same for each task order?
That's right, it's part of the basic Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity (ID/IQ) and the standards are same in performance-based terms. They have to 99 percent or 98 percent of the measurements on the given density list within the time period and report & that data needs to be received in the correct format, legible and readable by the Army Stamos system.
22. And all that information is communicated in the monthly report?
It's summarized, by exception, and if there really is an issue, in the last 12 months or so, there really hasn't been an issue Contractor's performance has been satisfactory.

23. Is there any additional information you would like to include in this research relevant to communication within this social network?
Each task order has its own statement of work and its own terms and conditions, according largely to the density list, the list of equipment applicable to that task order.

Contracting Officer Representative, Social Network B:

1. What is your role with regards to this service contract?
Quality assurance, contract is executed in accordance with (IAW) SOW, validating vouchers for payment
2. Who are your primary contacts in regards to this service contract?
Contractor Program Manager, Project Managers and Regional Managers
3. How often do you communicate with each of these people (daily, 3-4 times a week, 1 time a week, 2-3 times a month, once a month, quarterly, when the need arises)?
Daily to three-four times a week
4. What means of communication do you use with each of these people (i.e. in person, telephone, email)?
Telephone, email, face-to-face discussions
5. What reasons do you communicate with each of these people?
To insure requirements within the SOW are met and performed to standard and to maintain a level of quality called for in the QASP. Discuss burn rates
6. What types of information do you share with each of these people?
Spending, data requests and the accuracy of the data, methods to improve the data gathering, issues brought to the COR from the field
7. What point in the service contract's lifecycle were you appointed as the COR?
When the contract was awarded
8. Is there more than one COR on this Contract?
There is one primary COR and three secondary CORs
9. Are you a primary COR?
YES
10. To whom does each of the secondary CORs report?
They report to me, the primary COR.
11. Does each COR have an area of responsibility?
We all have the same area of responsibility. We have a plan laid out for conducting requirements of the contract and the QASP and all the sites we need to visit and based on who is available is who goes and conducts site visits.

12. What training did you receive to perform your duties as the COR?
Forty hour COR course and other training as required.
13. Have the secondary CORs had the same training as you have had?
Yes
14. How is your performance as a COR monitored?
 - *Through the deliverables of the contract*
 - *Through the budget office*
 - *By the KO*
 - *By my leadership*
15. How do you monitor the status of the service contract?
On site evaluations, CPARS
16. What surveillance is conducted on the contractor?
 - *Physical data verification. On site verification of the processes and procedures used by the contractor to execute the requirements of the SOW*
 - *Data verification, once the data has been vetted by the contractor, I check to insure the data is accurate*
17. Do you have a Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan you use when monitoring the contract? If not what document do you use?
Yes
18. Is there any additional information you would like to include in this research relevant to communication within this social network?
No

Customer Receiving the Service, Social Network B:

1. Who are your primary contacts in regards to this service contract?
Contracting officer, CORs
2. Who communicates with you in regards to this service contract?
My CORs are the primary interface.
3. How often do you communicate with each of these people (daily, 3-4 times a week, 1 time a week, 2-3 times a month, once a month, quarterly, when the need arises)?
I communicate daily with the CORs. I communicate with ACC-APG as needed.
4. In number three, you say you communicate daily with the CORs. Are there more than one?
There is one COR and there are three additional Assistant Contracting Officer Representatives (ACORs)

5. Is the COR a primary COR that the others report to?
Yes
6. Does each COR have an area of specialty?
Not specifically. They jointly support every aspect of the technical mission of the contract.
7. What determines how are they assigned to their specific tasks?
The Primary COR and I assign tasks as appropriate.
8. What means of communication do you use with each of these people (i.e. in person, telephone, email)?
All forms of communication are used.
9. What reasons do you communicate with each of these people?
With CORs, its normal business. If I engage with ACC-APG, there is usually an issue to be discussed.
10. What types of information do you share with each of these people?
Programmatic, technical execution, quality,...
11. Do you ever communicate directly with the contractor's rep?
Depends who you mean by contractor's rep. I do communicate with many of the contractor's personnel.
12. How do you monitor the status of the service contract?
Through communication with the CORs.
13. What monitoring / surveillance of the contractor are you aware of?
There is a QASP. There are regular site visits conducted. And, analysis of the data.
14. You mentioned that there are regular site visits conducted as part of monitoring/surveillance. Do you know how often those occur? Daily, weekly, biweekly, monthly?
The requirement is an annual site visit to each CONUS and OCONUS location. This is a minimum requirement. However, the execution of my mission results in visits being conducted multiple times throughout the year, but not necessarily on a pre-defined schedule.
15. Is it based on the Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan or something else?
Yes.
16. Is there any additional information you would like to include in this research relevant to communication within this social network?
Strong knowledgeable COR/ACOR are critical to be successful.

Contractor Providing the Service, Social Network B:

1. Who are your primary contacts in regards to this service contract?
Contracting Officer, Contracting Officer's Representative
2. Who communicates with you in regards to this service contract?

Contracting Officer and sometimes the COR with the contractor's Program Manager (PM).

3. How often do you communicate with each of these people (daily, 3-4 times a week, 1 time a week, 2-3 times a month, once a month, quarterly, when the need arises)?
Depending on what is being processed contractually anywhere from once a week to once a month.
4. What means of communication do you use with each of these people (i.e. in person, telephone, email)?
Telephone and email.
5. What reasons do you communicate with each of these people?
Contractual actions, questions, financial actions and questions.
6. How do you monitor the status of the service contract?
Contractually it is generally monitored through funding levels, when we reach 75 percent expenditure or when issues arise.
7. Do you think communication is helping with performance of the service contract?
Yes, due to the long time nature of the relationship we are better able to communicate and know what to expect out of the Contracts Shop.
8. What monitoring / surveillance of the contractor are you aware of?
The COR and contractor's PM are in constant (everyday) communication about the status of the contract.
9. Is it based on the Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan or something else?
N/A, see above
10. Is there any additional information you would like to include in this research relevant to communication within this social network?
I believe I speak with the COR more than any other COR due to the long time relationship with this contract and helping transition a new contractor's PM in this year.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

APPENDIX D. COR SOCIAL NETWORK C INTERVIEWS

Procuring Contracting Officer, Social Network C:

1. What is your role with regards to this service contract?
Administration after award. Includes any contracting matters, any administrative matters that comes up for that contract, modifications, if there's payment issues to be resolved, any problems, contractor problems, COR, all of that is my responsibility.
2. Who are your primary contacts in regards to this service contract?
COR. On this contract, I have not had to speak to the contractor. There are no problems. The thing about this environmental contract, and the COR in particular, they have a system down. So they don't have a lot of issues. The only time I've had any communication with the contractor was sending out modifications. That's pretty much it. I haven't had to speak to them or email them or they email me. There's been no issues.
3. Has this contractor been doing this on multiple contracts?
Yes.
4. Is this a follow-on?
They have regional geographic areas, so they're pretty much doing this, like this one is here at APG but there's another contract that I know they do the same thing, one that's Army-wide. So they have other areas, doing this environmental clean-up restoration.
5. Did this get competed at renewal?
Yes
6. Does this same company win it?
This particular contract, I'm not sure but there's a group of companies that are in the environmental arena that pretty much get all the environmental work. It's like a small community.
7. Who communicates with you in regards to this service contract?
COR and Contract Specialist
8. How often do you communicate with each of these people (daily, 3-4 times a week, 1 time a week, 2-3 times a month, once a month, quarterly, when the need arises)?
As needed basis. Have spoken with the COR maybe twice within the last six months. This particular contract...there's nothing to talk about.
9. What means of communication do you use with each of these people (i.e. in person, telephone, email)?
Email, not by phone on this contract.

10. What reasons do you communicate with each of these people?
If there are administrative issues need KO input/action
11. What types of information do you share with each of these people?
Regulations, policies, options available to any issues.
12. Is there a published plan on how and when communication should occur with each of these people?
No. But he does give me a monthly report via email.
13. Do you file or store a record of communication with any of these people for historical reference? If so how are you storing these records?
Emails are saved and filed electronically.
14. If you were to speak with the COR by phone, would you document your files or send a follow-on email to document your conversation?
Generally, if I have a phone conversation that I feel is significant, I will send an email to document but if it's just a 'hey, what do you think about this?', I won't do that.
15. How do you monitor the status of the service contract?
COR monthly reports, sent via email.
16. If there's nothing on it, you move on?
Yes
17. What monitoring / surveillance of the contractor are you aware of?
COR surveillance based on monthly reports.
18. If there is a problem, would the COR just send you the monthly report or would alert you to the problem beforehand?
If there is an issue that he needs to involve the contracting officer, he'll definitely call. And it'll also be noted in the monthly report. If it's on-going, he'll keep noting it in the monthly report until it's resolved.
19. Do you have to do CPARS on this contract?
Yes, but I don't do the CPARS, the COR would do the CPARS and I would just concur and finalize.
20. Is it based on the Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan or something else?
QASP, they have it down.
21. Is there any additional information you would like to include in this research relevant to communication within this social network?
Even though this particular contract runs smoothly, you definitely want to keep in contact with your COR, make sure that they are following the QASP and doing all their evaluations, making sure that the contractor is on track. You'll never know if something is wrong if they're not doing it, until one day a contractor calls you. Everything is screwed up. Or DFAS calls you, or somebody else calls you. And then it's big, hair-on-fire, thing. So it's very important to have a good COR on top of things.

Contracting Officer Representative/Customer Receiving Service, Social Network C:

1. What is your role with regards to this service contract?
COR
2. Who are your primary contacts in regards to this service contract?
The Contracting Officer. On this particular contract, there are no issues or anything. The KO has been approving the invoices, not the invoices but the COR monthly reports so officially, even though it's not him, he's still approving invoices so that needs to be changed within the VCE. I do my monthlies, so it does go up there and it's being reviewed. This is a relatively new contract, only two years old, so we can go in and answer some of the questions but no, I have not talked to him other than the monthly reports for this particular case because the contract itself is extremely good. They're a good company.
3. How often do you communicate with each of these people (daily, 3-4 times a week, 1 time a week, 2-3 times a month, once a month, quarterly, when the need arises)?
When the need arises (eight times a year). With this contract, in particular, it's been running smoothly, I really don't have to see or talk to the KO that often.
4. So I'm hearing you say is almost never?
On this contract. The other times we communicate is when, and I think this is where the contract specialist takes over is when we do funding. So at least once a year, we'll send the funding in to do the...we send the money all at once, then we'll get with the contract specialist. the contract specialist will handle the mods. This is unique, a very unique contract, a 10-year contract. We had to get special approval for this. We worked two years to get this contract through. Mainly because the operations and its benefit to the Government to extend it out. It's not just the treatment plants, but we have all the...a groundwater component to it. And for us to do a five year contract for the groundwater portion of it, we found out we got cut short, means that the remediation's not been fully completed yet and the contract's over. Then we'd have to start another contract, a new contractor, and we're back in the same boat as before. With this 10-year contract, we're able to pin the contractor down for remediation and an end goal. And that is the key. This style contract that we do here is different than the majority of your contracts. It's considered Performance Based Acquisition (PBA), and if you're not familiar with that, it's basically saying that here's your end goal, get us to the end goal.
5. Almost like a Statement of Objectives? How are you going to do it? That's what you say to the contractor.
Right. This is a \$28 million contract so this is a little bit larger scale than a simple one.

6. So the contractor wrote their own Performance Work Statement
Yes, well the evaluation, for this particular one, this was, I think Low Cost Technically Acceptable (LPTA) but we had to do the evaluation still to see what they're proposing is feasible or makes sense. For the environmental, it's not cut and dried. There are several ways to slice the orange and how to interpret it and, one of the things we had to do was determine, is it feasible, does it make sense, and can they get there from what they are saying? So that's how we did the evaluation. A little bit different than objectives, yes you can get your objectives, how you are going to get to your objectives is what the Army is concerned about. Are we going to have cost growths or increases? With this one, there is no cost growth. The company signs up for something, they are liable for it for the whole ten years.
7. So this was firm fixed price?
Firm fixed price. They had to plan for fuel increases, equipment replacement, if there's equipment that is going to have to be replaced within 10 years, they are responsible for replacing that equipment. Our job is to make sure that, with this one, that they maintain compliance and that they're not skipping out, like cheating us out, like bringing cheaper equipment, whatever, compliance is the driver. If they can't maintain compliance, then they're in trouble.
8. You say this contract runs very well, so you haven't had problems?
No, but there's a couple of things that I've learned, that I've done. I have many contracts right now, I've inherited some that I got in the middle of, this is one of the first ones that I've had from the beginning. So right off the bat, we decided to do monthly meetings. So we have monthly meetings, I have a program officer that works with me, who helps out and he maintains the plans and everything and we go to these monthly meetings. We send out an agenda, keep track of milestones, so it has been working well. And it is also the type of contract, overall, that fits well with monthly activities because we do have plans so we confer with any problems with the plans, things that are coming and we use that also in scoping for the future, for the next couple of months to a year out. And also, every year, we will go back to our PMP (that's our Project Management Plan) and to see where we're at plus any requirements that we need to do, that was part of the QASP that was developed. So that's one of the things that was good because that's initiated from the very beginning. And I've inherited that, not inherited, but I started out with that format and that's what we've been maintaining so we're already almost two years into it and that's why it's been running so smoothly.
9. So your communication is mostly with the contractor?
With the contractors, right. To make sure we keep on schedule, monthly meetings plus whatever conversations are needed, like work that's being done on this NIKE site, communication is done almost every other day.

10. What means of communication do you use with each of these people (i.e. in person, telephone, email)?
Telephone and email (80 percent), in person (20 percent)
Email, phone, face-to-face
11. It sounds like the monthly meetings really keep things on track?
Yes
12. And that's an opportunity to air any problems, concerns, whatever, right up front before they become big.
Right. And usually, if there's something that comes up like a scheduling issue or something like that and they need help, that's when, for the Government, I need your help on something to get through, then we establish that and we keep track of that so it's good. If we need something from them, it's on the record, and if they need something from us, it's on the record. So that's how we keep checks and balances between ourselves.
13. Sounds great. Sounds like more contracts should be that way.
Believe it or not, I also have an LTM contract, which is Long Term Management contract, and we are working the same way as I'm working on this contract, which is remedial, RAO, Remedial Action Operations. And both of them, I've patterned after each other and any new contracts I've gone through, I'm planning the same way.
14. Have you ever thought of doing any kind of COR training, you conducting the COR trainings?
I'd like to. I could see it happening. The problem is that the COR training is not necessarily real-world in a lot of ways.
15. If you did it with your success story, here at Aberdeen.
Here it works. The hardest part is the record-keeping, to make sure that my monthlys are in, and everything else. At the worst, I'm a month behind but they're up-to-date right now. And I've tried to maintain that. There's two parts to this. There's the COR part of actually managing the contract and then there's the paperwork that follows in there. And I have to give credit... VCE, I love it. I really do. I don't know why people will complain about it. To have it as electronic version vs. trying to keep records here. And I download all my invoices, all my major correspondence, and if there's something like a year end, which is part of the QASP, I'll download that into it too.
16. You like the VCE tool for your day-to-day work?
For, not the day-to-day, but for keeping track of everything. It's really good. All my invoices go in there, so now you have a record of my invoices, that I've approved the invoices. If there's any issues or problems, I would, not this contract that much, put it in there as a matter of record. So it's like electronically held there and that's so much better than having these paper things, this binds up and keep going. Most CORs will talk

about this, when you approve, I think that is nice. Most people don't agree with me, some people will, but I do.

17. Do you think you are more computer-savvy, so that lends itself as opposed to some who not.
Maybe, but I think those that see the computer as a bother are not willing to put the effort into it. If they know what the advantages are and how you can use it to your advantage, cause I can go up, pull up my contract, pull up other documents, even if I'm not at my computer, I can still get to VCE. So that's the advantage plus any questions from the KO, if there's an issue or anything else, go to my monthly reports, even though there's a standard format, I try to put in the blurb if I got, I received and approved the invoice. This shows a record that I did look at these invoices. My monthly reports will show anything that happens or what work has been done.
18. What reasons do you communicate with each of these people?
With the KO: Exercising a new CLIN, contract extension, contract advice. On other contracts that I have, I generally do talk to the KOs often, I prefer a site visit since they are here, I prefer seeing them in person. And I've always gone to them when I have a question about contracts. If I need to add, mod – they are always the first person I talk to and always ask 'what do you need from me' to get it done. I think that's very important. Don't tell the contractor 'Go ahead and do this'. You go to the KO first, say 'this is what I'm looking to do, can I do it, within the framework, and if I can, what are the steps to do it'. And then I'll work with the contractor and we'll get it together and do it. Very effective. Less heartburn for the KO, less heartburn for the COR, and everyone seems to get what we need. I think that a good bit of advice. Let's say there's a change in sampling. But for me to get out and do a new contract, it's going to cost me so much more than the actual sampling amount. Can I make the adjustment, what's the limit, can I do it, what documentation do I need? Those are the things that I can't tell a contractor not to sample, if it's more sampling, then I can't tell him to sample more without being covered. Sometimes you get a catch-22, the Perryman plant, where you had the carbon, you can't ship the carbon if it was hazardous or rated that way, you could fined far worse and be in more legal trouble than you did, so what do you do? You can't tell them not to do it but the decision has to be done. And you take that risk and sometimes it pans out, sometimes it doesn't. That's why we get paid as a COR or a KO. I try not to get in that position, I try to avoid it as much as possible.
19. What types of information do you share with each of these people?
Status update on the contract, monthlies. Issues or no issues. WAWF through the VCE tool.
20. What point in the service contract's lifecycle were you appointed as the COR?
Depends on the contract; at the beginning for two, in the middle for three.

It's a lot easier to start from the beginning of the contract and establish it. You don't miss it, we haven't missed a monthly meeting, I don't miss it. They might rearrange the schedule, if need be, we've moved it because I've gotten busy, but we're always there.

21. What training did you receive to perform your duties as the COR?
All the required COR classroom training, on the job training. I've been doing this since 2004 or 2005, I've been doing environmental restoration contracts. I've done some of the smaller stuff, but not on this scale. We're talking about order of magnitude of millions of dollars vs. couple hundred thousand. I've taken the DAU CLC 106, CLC 206, DAU course 222, the Ethics, the training, the ACR contracts, training which is the additional 40 hours. I took all that.
22. Do you feel like those classes helped you?
Not really. Except that I did take a few online courses specifically for interest. I took one related to closing out contracts, under not a dispute. Dispute resolutions, dispute things, cause at the time I was going through it. I just wanted more information and that was helpful. The terminology was the key. That I would say 'yes', others not as much. But the ones specifically related to what I needed it for 'yes'
23. How is your performance as a COR monitored?
Through VCE monitoring report.
24. How do you monitor the status of the service contract?
Currently we do monthly meetings, following up with reports, doing them right. And because it's such a large scope, I have a person that works for me who's almost like the ACOR, there's no such thing as an ACOR, he's there with me all the meetings and everything else, that's where we confer.
25. How often do you get out into the field to see this particular contract we're talking about?
This particular contract is just outside my door. I'll see parts of it every day. Usually the plant, the person who works for me, he goes out there on a weekly basis, maybe twice or three times a week depending on what's going on at the different plants. And I'll go out, maybe, monthly or bimonthly to the different sites cause I have other things and I'm the team lead. But we're always monitoring on a weekly basis. We also get monthly reports which I'll review and he'll review so it's constantly, plus the monthly meetings.
26. So many CORs say they are buried in paperwork...
It's very tough. That's why I have an assistant; he's out there in the field more than I am. My job is to make sure things are in order, things are moving, and to stay on top of it. I'm sort of like the super-COR. In my lead, that's what I am. I have a lot of contracts, my job is to make sure that things are moving forward and we're trying to meet our dates. I have other people to actually help me with the ground work.

27. In that respect, you are different than the other CORs I've spoken with. Others don't have the help that you are talking about.
Mainly, it's also because I have the most of my classes, I was the first one to get my classes done, my 40 hours, the extra trainings and all that, plus I'm the most active in dealing with contract office. If there are contract issues, I'm always with them, talking about contract issues so my experience is the reason why it gravitated to me, having so many contracts. I've gone through several different kinds of contracts. One of them, we did, not early termination, but we came to an agreement that parties need to separate and then go. Because of my temperament, I don't get upset or hyper, which is an advantage, I can deal with negotiations and move through things. I always look at the end point and work towards that. And I think that's the reason why this is why I have so many right now. It's just because I have the ability of going through, as an overview.
28. How many contracts do you have?
Right now I have four that I'm officially the COR. Then I'm also Technical POC for three other contracts for the Corps of Engineers. Some of my contracts are with the same company. So what I've done when I do monthly meetings, it's a monthly meeting for all the contracts. So my contractor for the Corps of Engineers, I also have one with RAO contract, our monthly meetings now cover both subjects. So now I'm keeping one meeting, keeping track of one company, and we did it with DVI. We bring people in, for 10-15 minutes and we talk about the one, then drop out and then we talk about the other subjects. Has worked very well.
29. Are any of these task order contracts?
Not in this case. They are all C contracts.
30. What surveillance is conducted on the contractor?
Review reports, field visits, invoice review.
31. Do you have a Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan you use when monitoring the contract? If not what document do you use?
Yes
32. Is there any additional information you would like to include in this research relevant to communication within this social network?
Ask KOs, 'how helpful are the CORs in getting the contract awarded'? Because I bet you if your get the COR whose helpful in getting the contract awarded and really invested, the back end of its probably better too. I have invested from beginning to end of these contracts that we talk about. Because I'm the team lead, I've been involved, reviewed. And even when it's over with, I'm still invested and I know what the requirements are, what we want so much better. When you get caught in the contracts that you inherited, those are my problem childs. They have always been a little harder to manage even though they're good contracts and everything

else, the past history's not there. You don't know what the other person did or what happened in the past, and you're trying to catch up, and you really don't. The more you help the KOs, it not only helps your contract, but it also helps with the bond of your KO. The KO learns a certain amount of trust with you. That's the other thing you can ask, when you deal with people as a COR, why do they recommend me or why do they recommend somebody else to do your report. Is it because they have that trust or know the person or how's that figured out? I think that's the question to the KOs, " why did you recommend this person"?

Another issue is the KOs requirements, I mean I've seen that, they're supposed to be doing this, this, and this. They can't do that. They have so many other contracts that the requirements that they say are the KOs are not realistic. So it really is the COR's job, I can't tell them what to do or interface, cause that in between, but at least I can protect the Government and the KO to the best of my ability. It's true, I understand these regs and rules to a point where the KO...it's not realistic. Even the COR, it's not realistic. Things that they are required to do. Supposed to be out there twice a week, three times a week, supposed to be doing this, doing that, not with our workloads.

Contractor providing the service, social network C:

1. Who are your primary contacts in regards to this service contract?
The contractor has three primary contacts, including:
 - *Contracting Officer's Representative [COR])*
 - *Technical Point of Contact [TPOC])*
 - *Program Manager*
2. Who communicates with you in regards to this service contract?
I have personnel communicate with all primary contacts on a routine basis. Given the size, complexity, scope, daily requirements, and POP associated with the contract, the contractor's team is comprised of a Senior Project Manager, two Assistant Project Managers, and an Operations Manager, all of whom maintain direct lines of communication to the COR and TPOC. Communication with the command's contact is maintained by the Senior Project Manager.
3. How often do you communicate with each of these people (daily, 3-4 times a week, 1 time a week, 2-3 times a month, once a month, quarterly, when the need arises)?
We communicate with our COR and TPOC on a daily basis, and frequently more than once a day. Communication with the PgM occurs weekly, when his schedule will permit. We also host monthly progress meetings with detailed agendas that are updated monthly to ensure

accurate, timely, and appropriate communication, and to resolve any technical or communication-related conflicts that may have arisen since the last monthly progress meeting.

4. What means of communication do you use with each of these people (i.e. in person, telephone, email)?

We communicate using all of the forms detailed above. The contractor opened an office approximately five minutes from the APG Main Gate and less than 10 minutes from the COR's office to maintain frequent, in-person communication. Both leadership/management and technical personnel routinely interact directly and in-person with the COR and TPOC on a routine (often daily) basis. The monthly progress meetings are held at the contractor's office and are attended in person by the COR and TPOC, and by the command's PgM when in town (office is located in San Antonio, Texas). When face-to-face contact is not possible due to travel, schedule conflicts, etc., communication is first handled through email, then by phone (or strictly by phone if the matter requires immediate attention or is sensitive).

5. What reasons do you communicate with each of these people?

Typical reasons are provided below:

- *COR: Technical, contractual, scope, schedule, budget, invoicing, progress reports, contractor evaluations, regulatory interaction, technical/administrative strategy, public interaction, etc.*
- *TPOC: Largely limited to technical, scope, schedule, regulatory interaction, technical/administrative strategy, and public interaction.*
- *Command PgM: Largely funding, legal, regulatory interaction, technical/administrative strategy, and public interaction.*

6. What types of information do you share with each of these people?

The contractor was awarded a performance-based acquisition, which requires that the Contractor achieve specific milestones by a specific date, or continue to perform services for the duration of the contract to comply with statutory and/or legal commitments made by the Army, but does not detail (through specifications, handbooks, manuals, etc.) how that Contractor must perform those requirements or meet those obligations. Essentially, it is up to the Contractor (with approval of the COR) to execute as efficiently and effectively as possible while complying with all statutory and legal requirements. In order to do so, the contractor believes in an open line of communication with all stakeholders (as defined in the Project Management Plan developed at the onset of the contract), and complete transparency. As a result, with the exception of direct cost information (i.e., labor rates, vendor invoices, subcontract agreements, internal resource allocation, etc.) to the contractor (the project is invoiced according to a negotiated payment milestone schedule,

and milestones are only invoiced when 100 percent complete), the contractor shares all technical, schedule, scope, materials and communication (i.e., emails, letters, etc.) with the Army project team. If requested by the KO, the contractor would also share wage data to demonstrate compliance with SCA/DBA/prevaling wage requirements.

7. How do you monitor the status of the service contract?
Frequent (daily) communication between the contractor's leadership team, open lines of communication with all project personnel (email, phone, and in-person), and direct communication with the Army project team to discuss technical issues and the contractor's performance. The monthly progress meetings referenced previously are critical to identifying and resolving any issues before they could potentially impact compliance, health and safety, and/or overall performance in support of the contract. The Contractor makes a point of discussing performance on a frequent, proactive basis (at least monthly), even though provided with an annual evaluation.
8. Do you think communication is helping with performance of the service contract?
Without question. The project has been successful in its first two years largely because of the open lines of communication that were established at project inception and maintained to date. We were able to establish trust early on with a new client by openly discussing challenges, concerns, and issues in complying with the contract requirements, as well as the transition of responsibility from another Contractor who had been providing the requisite services for more than six years prior to contract inception. The contractor's approach to communication varied significantly from our predecessor, who was not sharing all technical information with the TPOC. Therefore, it took several months to explain the differences in our approach, and establish and define the appropriate forms and frequency of communication; however, as a result of the effort, the project has been quite successful to date.
9. What monitoring / surveillance of the contractor are you aware of?
QASP-required surveillance, periodic inspections (by the COR, TPOC, the command PgM, Installation Safety Office, etc.), document reviews, monthly progress meetings, general communication/inquiries, etc.
10. Is it based on the Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan or something else?
Yes, a QASP was co-developed by the contractor and the Army project team at contract inception.
11. Is there any additional information you would like to include in this research relevant to communication within this social network?
The contractor recognized early on that a strong, diversified, and unified leadership team would be the key to our success. We were assuming responsibility for a project that had been managed successfully by another

Contractor prior to our involvement, and for assembling a new project team using both the contractor personnel and personnel from the previous Contractor (who naturally transitioned with the contract to maintain continuity and institutional knowledge). We knew we'd have to both establish a new, unique identity with the client and our new employees, while retaining/maintaining what worked successfully in the past. Without this recognition and associated approach/foundation, we wouldn't have been able to develop and establish an effective and consistent communication plan.

LIST OF REFERENCES

- APG facts*. (2013). Retrieved August 2013, from <http://www.apg.army.mil/facts.cfm>
- Apte, U. M., Ferrer, G., Lewis, I. A., & Rendon, R. G. (2006). *Managing the services supply chain in the Department of Defense: Opportunities and challenges* (NPS-AM-06-085). Retrieved from <http://acquisitionresearch.net/files/FY2006/NPS-AM-06-085.pdf>
- Army Contracting Command. (2010, March). *Interim Army Contracting Command: Contracting officer's representative policy guide* (Pamphlet 70-1). Retrieved January 2013, from https://acc.dau.mil/adl/en-US/389650/file/52603/ACC%20Pamphlet%2070-1_Signed.pdf
- Army Contracting Command. (2012, May). *Army contracting command desk book*. Retrieved January 2013, from http://www/409csb.army.mil/Library/PP-Deskbooks/ACC_DeskBook.pdf
- Army Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement*. Part 5153. Retrieved November 18, 2012, from <http://farsite.hill.af.mil/vfafara.htm>
- Bennet, J. T. (2013, February 8). *How big would DoD budget be under sequestration? Historically big, it turns out*. [Blog comment]. Retrieved from <http://blogs.defensenews.com/intercepts/2013/02/how-big-would-dod-budget-be-under-sequestration-pretty-big-it-turns-out/>
- Berteau, D., Ben-Ari, G., Sanders, G., Morrow, D., & Ellman, J. (2012). U.S. Department of Defense services contract spending and the supporting industrial base, 2000-2011. Retrieved from <http://www.acquisitionresearch.net/files/FY2012/NPS-AM-12-C9P16R01-074.pdf>
- Defense AT&L. (2013, July–August). Kendall kicks off better buying power 2.0. Retrieved from <http://www.dau.mil/publications/DefenseATL/default.aspx>.
- Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement*, 48 C.F.R. ch. 2 (2013). Retrieved from <http://farsite.hill.af.mil/vfdfara.htm>
- Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplemental Procedures, Guidance and Information. (2013). Retrieved from <http://farsite.hill.af.mil/vfdfara.htm>
- Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy. (2012). Spend analysis, FY 2011 DoD spend analysis serves and s&e overview [Powerpoint]. Retrieved from https://extranet.acq.osd.mil/dpap/pass/ss/spend_analysis.html

- Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy. (2012). *Guidebook for the acquisition of services*. Retrieved from http://www.acq.osd.mil/dpap/ccap/cc/corhb/Files/Miscellaneous_Training/Guidebook_for_Acquisition_of_Services_24March2012.pdf
- Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy. (2013). *Taxonomy and spend analysis*. Retrieved from <http://www.acq.osd.mil/dpap/ss/taxonomy.html>
- Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy. (2013). *Fiscal year 2012 spend chart*. Retrieved from http://www.acq.osd.mil/dpap/sa/docs/TAB1PDUSD_briefing_5-June_final.pptx
- Department of Defense. (2000). *Guidebook for performance-based services acquisition in the Department of Defense*. Retrieved from <https://www.acquisition.gov/sevensteps/library/DODguidebook-pbsa.pdf>
- Department of the Army. (2010). *Management and oversight of service acquisitions (Army Regulation 70-13)*. Retrieved from http://www.apd.army.mil/jw2/xmldemo/r70_13/cover.asp
- Ellman, J., Morrow, D., & Sanders, G. (2012). *U.S. Department of Defense contract spending and the supporting industrial base*. Retrieved from http://csis.org/files/publication/120914_Berteau_DoDContractSpending_Web2.pdf
- Federal Acquisition Regulation*, 48 C.F.R. pts 1-53. (2013). Retrieved from <http://farsite.hill.af.mil/vffara.htm>
- Gansler, J. (2011). *Democracy's arsenal: Creating a twenty-first-century defense industry*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Gansler, J. S., Berteau, D. J., Maddox, D. M., Oliver, D. R., Salomon, L. E., & Singley, G. T. (2007). *Urgent reform required: Army expeditionary contracting: Report of the commission on Army acquisition and program management in expeditionary operations*. Retrieved from http://www.army.mil/docs/Gansler_Commission_Report_Final_071031.pdf
- Government Accountability Office. (2005). *Contract management: Opportunities to improve surveillance on Department of Defense service contracts* (GAO-05-274). Retrieved from <http://www.gao.gov/assets/250/245676.pdf>
- Government Accountability Office. (2011). *Acquisition workforce: DoD's efforts to rebuild capacity have shown some progress*: (GAO-12-232T). Retrieved from <http://www.gao.gov/assets/590/586289.pdf>
- Government Accountability Office. (2011). *High-risk series: An update* (GAO-11-278). Retrieved from <http://www.gao.gov/assets/320/315725.pdf>

- Government Accountability Office. (2012). *Defense acquisition workforce: Improved processes, guidance, and planning needed to enhance use of workforce funds* (GAO-12-747R). Retrieved from <http://www.gao.gov/assets/600/591766.pdf>
- Judy, J. W. (2012). *An empirical study of the social network of the contracting officer's representative*. Retrieved from <http://www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a570665.pdf>
- Manuel, K. M. (2013). *Evaluating the "past performance" of federal contractors: Legal requirements and issues* (CRS Report No. R41562). Retrieved from <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R41562.pdf>
- McHugh, J. M., & Odierno, R. T. (2013, January 16). Risk mitigation in the face of fiscal uncertainty [Memorandum]. U.S. Department of the Army. Retrieved from http://www.pscouncil.org/c/e/EventList/Sequestration/army_guidance.aspx
- Murdock, C. (2013, February 8). *The sequester and the debt ceiling, explained*. Retrieved from http://www.washingtonpost.com/business/economy/the-sequester-and-the-debt-ceiling-explained/2013/02/11/b4fe7260-7205-11e2-ac36-3d8d9dcaa2e2_gallery.html#photo=1
- Office of the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller)/Chief Financial Officer. (2012). *Fiscal year 2013 budget request overview*. Retrieved from http://comptroller.defense.gov/defbudget/fy2014/FY2014_Budget_Request_Overview_Book.pdf
- Office of the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller)/Chief Financial Officer. (2013). *Fiscal year 2014 budget request overview*. Retrieved from http://comptroller.defense.gov/defbudget/fy2014/FY2014_Budget_Request_Overview_Book.pdf
- Rendon, R. C., Apte, U. M., & Apte, A. (2012, January). Services acquisition in the DoD: A comparison of management practices in the Army, Navy, and Air Force. *Defense Acquisition Research Journal*, 19(1), 003–032. Retrieved from <http://www.dau.mil/pubscats/PubsCats/AR%20Journal/arj61/Rendon61.pdf>
- U.S. Army Acquisition Support Center. (2011, May). *Defense acquisition workforce development fund (Section 852), Department of the Army operating guide*. Retrieved from http://asc.army.mil/docs/programs/852/Section_852_Operating_Guide.pdf
- Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, & Logistics. (2010, September). *Better buying power: Guidance for obtaining greater efficiency and productivity in defense spending* [memorandum]. Retrieved from http://www.acq.osd.mil/dpap/cpf/docs/USD_ATL_Guidance_Memo_September_14_2010_FINAL.PDF

Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, & Logistics. (2012, November). *Better buying power 2.0: Continuing the pursuit for greater efficiency and productivity in defense spending* [memorandum]. Retrieved July 2013, from <http://www.acq.osd.mil/dpap/sa/news/index.html>

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

1. Defense Technical Information Center
Ft. Belvoir, Virginia
2. Dudley Knox Library
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, California